THE FALL OF PAPISTRY,

AND

THE WEAKE FOVNDATION thereof plainely Showed : by way of ARTICLES.

With a Challenge to all Englisſh Ieſuites, and *Ieſuited, or Italianiz'd Papiſts : daring them all* joyntly, and euery one of them ſeuerally, to make anſwer thereunto; if they can, or haue any Truth on their ſide: *Knowing for a Truth, that otherwiſe, all the World* will cry with open mouths, Fie vpon them and their patched hotch-potch Religion.

By T. B.

PSAL. 116. Verſ. 10.

Credidi, propter quod loquutus ſum.

LONDON,
Printed. 1628.

To all Engliſh Ieſuits, Seminarie prieſts, and Ieſuited papiſts, in England, Scotland, or whereſoeuer elſe.

I Haue written many times at large in larger volumes, heartily and inſtantly deſiring to haue receiued ſome anſwere from you, either from all ioyntly, or from ſome of you ſeuerallie. In my firſt booke, publiſhed in the yeare 1593, I promiſed to yeeld, if any of you could conuince me; either to haue alleaged any writer corruptly, or to haue quoted any place guilefullie, or to haue charged any author falſlie: ſince that time I haue challenged you againe and again to anſwere me, but Negry quidem *will be had; no anſwere can you make, or dare you make. In regard hereof, I haue at this preſent compiled a few articles couched in a ſmall roome, challenging you once againe, to frame the beſt anſwer you can vnto the ſame: if you can ſincerely and truelie confute theſe articles, or any one of my former bookes, I promiſe herewith (and I proteſt before God to performe it) to ſubſcribe vnto your doctrine. If you therefore ſhall re-*

In my Motiues, booke. 2. cap. 1.

fuse to answere me, because you cannot, for if you can, you will vndoubtedlie performe it) all wise men which haue any care of their saluation, will without all peraduenture after notice hereof made knowne vnto them, crie, Fie vpon you and your religion. Answere therefore ô papists, if ye can: if ye cannot so do, then repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

Farewell.

THE FIRST ARTICLE, of the falſely ſo ſuppoſed ſoue-raignty of the Biſhop of Rome.

YOu Papiſts tell vs, that your Pope, the Biſhop of Rome, is aboue all powers and potentates on earth, that he can depoſe Kings and Emperours from their royall thrones, and tranſlate their Empires and Regalities at his good will and pleaſure. But this doctrine is falſe, abſurd, and nothing els but a meere fable: and conſequently, late Romiſh religion conſiſteth of falſhoods, fables, and flat leaſings.

The propoſition, the Ieſuit *Bellarmine* that late Romiſh Cardinall, ſetteth downe in theſe wordes: *Si ergo princeps aliquis ex oue aut ariete fiat lupus, id eſt, ex Chriſtiano fiat hæreticus, poterit paſtor eccleſiæ eum arcere per excommunicationem, & ſimul iubere populo, ne eum ſequantur, ac proinde priuare eum domino in ſubditos.* *Bellarm. lib. 5. de Rom. pont. ca. 7. col. 24.*

If therefore any Prince of a ſheepe or ramme become a woolfe, that is to ſay, of a Chriſtian be made an hereticke; then the paſtor of the Church (the Pope forſooth) may

driue him away by excommunication, and withall, commaund the people not to obey him, and therefore depriue him of his dominion ouer his subiects. Thus wee see, that when any prince is not, or ceaseth to be a Papist, for that (with this Iesuiticall Cardinall and all others of his brood) is to be an hereticke; then the Pope forsooth may depose such a prince from his royall scepter, and absolue his subiectes from their allegeaunce to him. This is the common doctrine of all Iesuited Papistes, as I haue prooued in my Anatomy of Popish tyrannie.

Gregor lib. 2. epist. 61. cap. 100.

The assumption is prooued by the flatte testimonie of their famous Pope *Gregorie* the great, in these wordes: *Ego quidem inscioni subiectus, eandem legem per diuersas terrarum partes transmitti feci; & quia lex ipsa omnipotenti deo minime concordat, ecce, per suggestionis meæ paginam, serenissimis dominis nunciaui; vtrobique ergo quæ debui exolui, qui & imperatori obedientiam præbui, & pro deo quod sensi, minimè tacui.*

I being your subiect, and at your commaund, haue caused the same Lawe to be sent through diuerse partes of the land; and because the Lawe it selfe dooth not accord to Gods will, behold, I haue signified so much vnto your Maiestie by my epistle; and so I haue discharged my duety in both respects, as who haue rendered mine obedience to the Emperour, and haue not concealed what I thought in Gods behalfe.

These are the wordes of *Gregorius*, who was himselfe Bishop of *Rome*, *Anno* 603. and liued aboue sixe hundred yeares after Christ; for which time the Popes liued in dutifull obedience vnder the Emperours, as is euident by his expresse wordes already alleadged: For first, Pope *Gregorie* freely and willingly acknowledgeth the Emperour to be his soueraigne Lord.

Secondly, hee confesseth himselfe to be the Emperours subiect.

Thirdly, he graunteth that hee oweth loyall obedience to the Emperour, and for that respect he thought himselfe bound in conscience to publish the Emperors lawe, though

in

in some parte it seemed to disagree with Gods will; and that (forsooth) lest he should be found guiltie of disloyalty toward his prince.

Fourthly, this alleageance he acknowledged to the Emperour *Mauritius*, who liued more then six hundred yeares after Christs sacred incarnation. During which tearme of yeares, the Bishops of *Rome*, now called Popes, liued in subiection to the Emperours of *Rome*, as other Bishops do this day to their lawfull kings.

S. *Ambrose* freeth Kings from all lawes made by man, these are his expresse wordes: *Rex vtique erat, nullis ipse legibus tenebatur humanis. Neque enim reges vllis ad pœnam vocantur legibus, tuti imperij potestate. Homini ergo non peccauit, cui non tenebatur obnoxius.* *Ambros. de apologia Dauid, ca. 10. pa. 386.*

Hee was indeede a King, he was subiect to no lawe of man: for Kings being freed by royall prerogatiues of imperiall power, are not punishable by the lawes of man. He therefore sinned not to man, to whom he was not subiect. S. *Hierome* teacheth the same doctrine, if his wordes be well marked. *Hiero. tom. 1. fol. 63. d.*

Enthimius hath these wordes, *Cum sim rex, & te solum commissorum à me scelerum iudicem habeam, tibi soli peccasse videor; hoc est, tibi soli iudici subijcior. Caterorum enim omnium ego dominus sum, & ob potentiam meam licere mihi videntur, quæcunque libuerint.* *Enthi. in Psal. 50.*

Seeing I am a King, and haue thee onely my iudge ouer my sinnes, I seeme to sinne onely to thee; that is, I am subiect onely to thee, as to my iudge. For I am Lord ouer all others, and in regarde of my power and maiestie, whatsoeuer pleaseth me, seemeth to be lawfull for me.

The Popish ordinarie glosse singeth the same Song, these are the expresse wordes: *Rex omnibus superior, tantum à deo puniendus est.* *Glossa ordi. in Psal. 50.*

The King is aboue all, and he can be punished of none but of God alone.

Nicolaus Lyranus, a man of great reckoning with the Papists, teacheth the same doctrine with the rest. These *Lyranus in Psal. 50.*

are

are his expresse words; *Tibi soli peccaui, scilicet tanquam iudici & punire potenti. Peccauerat enim contra Uriam, & alios occasione huius interfectos. Tamen quia erat Rex, non habebat iudicem superiorem qui posset eum punire, nisi deum.*

To thee onely haue I sinned; that is to say, to thee onely, as to my Iudge, and to him that can punish me. For he had now sinned against *Urias* and others, whome hee caused to be murthered by that occasion: yet because he was a king, hee had no superiour iudge that could punish or controule him, saue God alone.

Aquin. 1.2. q. 96. ar. 5. ad. 3. *Thomas Aquinas*, being as it were halfe a god with the Papistes, teacheth the selfe same doctrine, with *Lyra* and the rest. But I hasten to the verdict of a Cardinall of *Rome*.

Hugo Card. in Psal. 50. *Hugo Cardinalis* hath these expresse wordes; *Tibi soli, quia non est super me alius quam tu, qui possit punire. Ego enim sum rex, & non est aliquis praeter te super me.*

To thee onely, saith Cardinall *Hugo*, because there is not any aboue me but thy selfe alone, that hath power to punish me: for I am a king, and so besides thee, there is none aboue me.

See S. *Cyprians* opinion in the sixt article folowing, in the first proposition and second reason; and note it well, because it is of great importance.

Thus (gentle Reader) it is cleere and euident, as well by the flat testimonie of the auntient Fathers, as also of most famous and renowmed Popish Writers; that the Pope or Bishop of *Rome* is so farre from hauing power to depose Kings and Emperours, that hee himselfe ought to be subiect to them, and hath no authoritie at all to punish them. What can be more plainely spoken? What testimonies can be more manifest? What Doctrine can be more cleere? for if none but God be superiour to the King, if none but God can iudge the King, if none but God can punish the king, (all which both auntient Fathers, and the Popes owne deare Doctours affirme) then doubtlesse cannot the Pope depose the King; then can he not absolue his subiects from their allegeaunce; then can hee not translate Empires and Kingdomes, and bestow the same at his owne pleasure. The good Kings, *Iosue*, *Dauid*, *Salomon*,

Salomon, *Iosaphat*, *Ezechias*, and *Iosias*; knew right well, that they had authoritie aboue all the prieſtes, and therefore tooke vpon them, not onelie to commaund and controll them, but alſo to depoſe and thruſt them from their places and functions, yea euen the high prieſts themſelues, when their deſerts did ſo require. Which thing is prooued at large in my golden ballance of triall. Yet heere for better ſatisfaction of the vulgar people, I will propound a common obiection that much troubleth many of them; and that done, frame a plaine and ſincere ſolution to the ſame.

The Obiection.

The Empire was tranſlated by the Popes authoritie, and the Emperours after their election are this day confirmed by the Pope: yea, many Emperours haue acknowledged the Popes ſoueraigntie ouer them, in ſo much as they haue fallen downe proſtrate, and kiſſed his holie feete.

The Anſwer.

I anſwer, that many abſurd things haue beene affirmed by popiſh paraſites, for the aduauncement of the primacie, as *Franciſcus à Victoria*, a famous Popiſh Schoole doctor, and Spaniſh frier, ſometime profeſſour of Theologie in the Vniuerſitie of *Salmantica*, dooth teſtifie in theſe wordes; *Sed gloſſatores iuris hoc dominium dederunt papæ, cum ipſi eſſent pauperes rebus & doctrina.* *Victor. de poteſt. eccleſ. relect. 1. ſect. 2. pag. 39.*

But the Gloſſers of the Popes law (ſaith this great Doctor and zealous Papiſt, for the truth it ſelfe enforced him to vtter the trueth) gaue this dominion (and theſe lordly titles) vnto the Pope, when themſelues were blinde bayards and beggarly fellowes.

Thus writeth their owne Popiſh Frier, affirming that ignorance and pouertie were the beginning of all lordly Popelie: and no maruell; for by reaſon of their pouerty,

they flattered and sought to please the Pope, and by reason of their ignorance, they set abroach many things which they did not vnderstand.

Iohannes Gerson, a famous papist likewise, and sometime Chancelor of *Paris*, reporteth much like stuffe, and more lordly titles ascribed to the Pope by his popish parasites. These are his expresse wordes; *Sicut Christo collata est omnis potestas in cœlo & in terra, sic eam Christus omnem Petro suisq; successoribus dereliquit. Sequitur, sicut non est potestas nisi à deo, sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica, imperialis vel regalis, nisi à Papa; in cuius fœmore scripsit Christus, rex regum, dominus dominantium; de potestate disputare, instar sacrilegij est; cuis neq; quisquam dicere potest, cur ita facis.*

Gerson de potest. ecclesiast. consid. 12. part. 3.

As all power was giuen to Christ in heauen and on earth, so Christ left all the same power to *Peter*, and to his successours the Bishoppes of *Rome*. As there is no power but of God, so is there neyther any temporall or ecclesiasticall, neither imperiall nor regall, but of the Pope; in whose thigh Christ hath written, The King of kinges and Lord of lordes; of whose power to dispute, is as it were sacriledge; to whome no man may say, Why doost thou so?

These are the wordes of this great learned Doctor, who though he were a zealous papist, yet could he not conceale these Antichristian blasphemies within his breast. Neuertheless Pope *Boniface*, or (if you will) Pope *Maliface*, did not onely acknowledge them, but with great pleasure practised the same, as witnesseth the said *Gerson* in these words *Hanc existimationem habuisse visus est Bonifacius octauus in quadam decretali; putatur ab aliis, depositio vnius regis Francie per patam Zachariam hic esse fundata; tanquam papa sit, qui transferre possit reges & regna.*

Gerson vbi supra.

Pope *Boniface* the eight, seemeth in a certaine decretall to haue had this opinion of his owne authoritie. Others thinke, that the deposition of (*Childericus*) the French King by Pope *Zacharie*, was grounded in this (Antichristian and godlesse conceit:) as if forsooth the Pope were he,

hee, that could depose princes, and translate their kingdomes.

By these Authorities it is cleare, that the late Bishops of *Rome* haue taken vpon them, not onelie to depose Kings, and to translate their kingdomes: but withall haue challenged more than humane and royall power, euen that power which is due and proper to God alone. So as wee haue not so much to consider what hath beene doone, as what ought of right to be doone. I will therefore for perspicuitie sake proceede by way of gradation, and set downe the very steppes of the ladder, by which the late Bishop of *Rome* did climbe vppe to their vsurped tyrannicall primacie.

1 The first steppe, was the departure of the Emperour *Constantius* from *Rome* to *Constantinople*, at what time (as the Popes parasites tell vs) the Emperour gaue large giftes to the Pope, euen his whole power, dominion, and territories, both in *Rome*, *Italie*, and all the West partes: for thus is it written by *Gratian* in the popes own decrees: *Constantius imperator coronam & omnem regiam dignitatem in urbe Romana, & in Italia, & in partibus occidentalibus Apostolice concessit. Sequitur, decreuimus etiam, & hoc, vt ipse & successores eius diademate, viz. coronam quam ex capite nostro illi concessimus ex auro purissimo & gemmis pretiosis, vti debeat pro honore B. Petri.* *Constantine* the Emperor gaue the Pope his Crowne and all royall dignitie in the Cittie of *Rome*, and in *Italie*, and in all the West partes. It followeth a little after in the next Canon. Wee therefore haue made also this Decree, that the Pope and his successors shall for the honor of S. *Peter*, weare the crowne of pure gold and pretious stones, which wee haue giuen him from off our owne head. Thus saith the Decree. But *Laurentius Valla*, *Raphael Volaterranus*, *Paulus Catthalanus*, *Nicholaus Cusanus*, and many other popish Writers, repute the same as a fable. Yea our Iesuite *Bellarmine* seemeth to doubt thereof, and of other like supposed donations, and therefore hath hee inuented a soueraigne remedy for the same. These are his expresse words:

Dist. 96. cap. Constantinus.

Bellarm. lib. 5. de rom. pont. cap. 9.

Extant Romæ authentica instrumenta harum & similium donationum. Sed etiamsi nihil horum extaret, abunde sufficeret prescriptio 800. annorum. Nam etiam regna & imperia per latrocinium acquisita, tandem longo tempore fiunt legitima.

There be extant at *Rome* authenticall instruments of these and the like giftes. But if there were no such thing, yet would prescription of 800. yeares be sufficient: for euen kingdomes and empires gotten by robberie, through continuance of time become lawfull. Thus writeth our Iesuite, who hath left nothing vnsaid, that can be saide for Poperie.

The second step, was the fall of the Empire in the West. For after the diuision of the Empire, it begunne daily to decline, and was vtterly dissolued in *Augustulus*, in the yeare 471. of whome was made this Epigramme; *Augustus Romanum imperium condidit, Augustulus labefactauit. Augustus* set vp the Empire, but *Augustulus* pulled it downe. For after *Orestes* his father was slaine (who was neuer Emperour but a Captaine vnder *Nepos*) the saide *Augustulus* gaue vp the diademe, and betooke himselfe to a priuate life. From this time the Empire in the West was vacant about 330. yeares. By meanes whereof, the Popes power did daily increase by little and little, and from step to step.

Ann. Do. 471. *Aim. ac. Burdeg. pa. 93.*

The Vissigothes ruled in *Spaine*, the Abienes in *Guian* and *Gascoyne*, the Frenchmen in the residue of *Fraunce*, the Vandales in *Affricke*, the Saxons in *Brittaine*, the Ostrogothes in *Hungarie*, the Herules and Turdilings in *Italie*, and in the citty of *Rome*: onely the name of the Empire remained with *Zenon* in the East. About the yeare 536. *Totilas* king of the Gothes by force of armes and famine subdued well neere all *Italie*, and after long siege tooke the Cittie of *Rome*, and spoyled it with sword and fire, ouerthrowing the walles and towers euen vnto the ground, and vntill *Carolus Magnus* the Abiens and Barbarians possessed all *Italie*.

Ann. Do. 536

The third steppe was the voluntary Charter which *Constantine* the Emperour of *Constantinople* made to Pope *Benedict*

dict the second, *viz.* that whomsoeuer the Cleargie, people, and the Romane souldiours should chuse to be Bishop, all men should beleeue him to be the true Vicar of Christ, without any tarrying for any authoritie of the Emperour of *Constantinople*, or the Deputie of *Italie*, as the custome and manner was euer before that day. Thus writeth *Platina*, who was the Popes owne deere vassale. This was a verie gallant steppe: for as you see heere, the Popes for the space almost of seauen hundred yeares, *viz.* vntill this *Bennet* in the yeare 684. acknowledged the Emperours for their superiors and lords, without whose letters patents they could haue no iurisdiction, nor be reputed the true Bishops of *Rome*: but now the Bishops of *Rome*, by priuiledge granted from this Emperour, wrested their neckes from the Emperours subiection. Let these wordes of *Platina* be well remembred; because hee being a famous Papist, must needes be of good credite against them. I let passe the petite steppe, when the Emperour *Phocas* made *Rome* the head of all Churches, which for all that, is of some moment.

Ann. Do. 684

Platina in vita Benedicti secundi.

Vide Ar. Perkins fol. 111. a

Ann. Do. 607

The fourth steppe, was the great amitie betweene *Zacharie* then Bishop of *Rome*, and *Pipine* Gouernour of *Fraunce* vnder *Childerich* the King: for *Pipine* purposing to defeate his Lord and Soueraigne of the Kingdome, and to inuest himselfe therein, sent his Ambassadours to *Zacharie* then Bishop of *Rome*, and his bounden friend, to demaund this question of him, *viz.* Whether hee were more worthy to be King, which was king only by name and naturall succession; or els he, who bare the whole burthen of the kingdome alone, and yet lacked the dignitie of a king? The Pope vnderstanding the parable right well, and respecting his owne future aduauncement likely to ensue thereupon, answered roundly (I will not say clearkely, but like a right Doctor of the Romish rowt) that it was more rightfull forsooth, that hee which tooke the charge of all things, should be called King. Vpon this iudgement so clearkely yeelded, *Pipine* foorthwith presumed to depose

Ann Do. 751

Childerich, and made himselfe King: That doone, saintlesse (not sackelesse) *Zacharie* the bishop of *Rome* (that Antichrists fore runner might be knowne) assoyled *Pipine* and the other French men of their oath of allegeance and fealtie made to *Childerich*, and confirmed *Pipine* the traitor in the kingdome of *Fraunce*. This was indeed a step, not of *Iacobs* ladder, nor of *Scala cœli*, but of *Scala inferni*, *Scala Antichristi*, and of the ladder of the maister diuell of hell. Yet is not our Iesuite and Cardinall *Bellarmine* (the mouth of all papists, and of the Pope himselfe) ashamed to publish the same as a ground of the popish religion. For these are his owne wordes: *Childericum deposuit Zacharias & in eius locum Pipinum Caroli magni patrem creari iussit. Cuius causa fuit quia propter socordiam Childerici, & religionis & regno in Gallia extrema ruina imminere videbatur.*

Geneſſ.28. v.12.

Bellarm.lib.5. de Rom. pont. cap.8.

Pope *Zacharie* deposed *Childericke*, and commanded to place and inuest *Pipine* father to *Charles* the great, in his throne: the cause whereof was this: because forsooth, thorow the slouthfull and negligent gouernement of *Childericus*, the kingdome and religion in *Fraunce* seemed to be in great daunger. This is the deepe Diuinitie of the Pope and his Clergie, by which we may learne many woorthie Lessons.

1 First, that the Pope may set vp and pull downe kings at his pleasure by Iesuiticall doctrine and late Romish religion.

2 Secondly, that the Pope and Iesuites are the grandmasters and architects of seditions, rebellions, and most bloudie treasons.

3 Thirdly, that it is very true which the secular priestes haue written, concerning the traiterous proceedings of Iesuites and Iesuited papists.

4 Fourthly, that the Pope commaunded to depose the Soueraigne, and to inthronize the subiect in his place.

5 Fifthly, that all this was doone, because forsooth the King did not rule after the Popes fansie and pleasure. Hereupon I inferre this necessarie correlarie, *viz.* that it

hooueth

hooueth Christian Kings to be vigilant, and in due time to expell all traiterous papists out of their dominions. And if the Bishoppe of *Rome* shall send any seditious popeling into their kingdomes and territories, with his thunderbolts, bulls, and excommunications; then to deale with the Messengers, as King *Phillip* the Faire dealt with Pope *Boniface* his Nuncioes in *Fraunce*; whome hee committed to prison, and caused the popes bulles to bee burnt in the fire. And as *Charles* the sixt, when *Bennet* the thirteenth did interdict his realme, sitting in the throne of Iustice in his high Court of parliament the 21. of May, in the yeere 1408. gaue sentence, that the bull should be rent in peeces, and that *Gonsalue* and *Conseleux* the bearers thereof shoulde bee set vppon a pillorie, and publiquely traduced in the pulpit. The Storie is set downe at large by the French papistes, in their booke intituled, The Iesuites Catechisme, and the same is recorded in my Anatomy of popish tyrannie.

An. D. 1294.

An. D. 1408.

The fift steppe was the decay of the Empire in the East, about the yeere 756. For when *Aistulphus*, or (as some write) *Aristulphus* King of the Lombards, besieged the city of *Rome* for the space of three whole moneths, exacting an huge tribute of the Romaines; then Pope *Stephanus* the second made suite to *Pipinus* King of *Fraunce* to stand their good Maister, and to defend the Cittie from the fury of the Lombardes. King *Pipine* willing to gratifie his good friend the bishop of *Rome*, came with a mightie army against *Aistulphus*, and besieged him in *Pauie*; and then and there constrained him to appeale to his mercie, and to yeelde vp the exerchate of *Rauenna* and *Pentapolis* into his handes. This being effected, King *Pipine* (whom pope *Zacharie* of a traytour had made King, as is alreadie prooued) gaue vppe the gouernement of *Italie* into the popes handes. And the King had reason so to doe: for as wee know, one good turne requires another. So now the Lieutenants of the Emperours of *Constantinople*, ended their whole power in *Italie*, who aforetime had their seats

Ann. Do. 756

Manus manum farica.

at *Rauenna*: and now was he taken out of the way, who
2. *Thessa.* 2. (as the Apostle telleth vs) did hinder the comming of Antichrist: for Pope *Stephen* in way of gratitude confirmed the inheritance royall of the kingdome of *Fraunce* to the said *Pipine* and to his posterity for euer. Heere began a new progenie of the kings of *Fraunce*: for *Chilidericus* was the last king of the stocke of *Meroneus*, who was the first king Christian of *Fraunce*. This truth is apparant by the testimony of many renowmed Chronographers, it cannot be denied.

Bellarm. tom. 3 col. 827. The sixt steppe, was the translation of the Romane Empire from the Greekes to the Frenchmen or Germans, in the person of magnificall *Charles*, as the Iesuit *Bellarmine* tearmeth him. The trueth is this, as popish Chronographers doe record and testifie to the world; *viz.* That when the Romans had driuen from among them, Pope *Leo* the third, hee appealed to *Charles* then King of *Fraunce*, who came to *Rome*, and examined the matter: and in the end appeased the Romanes, and restored the Pope to his place and dignitie againe. For this good worke and kinde fauour of the King, the Pope, and people of *Rome*, hauing now a long time in minde and affection, reuolted from the Emperour of *Constantinople*; and seeing a fit opportunitie offered to accomplish their long wished desires, did with vniforme consent and ioyfull acclamation proclaime *Charles* the Great, the Emperour of *Rome*, giuing him the imperiall names of *Cæsar* and *Augustus*, and setting the royall Diademe vppon his head by the handes of Pope *Leo*. And for the better credite of mine assertion, I will heere recount the very wordes of *Sigebertus*, a famous Chronographer and popish Monke, who therefore must needes be of credite with the Pope and all his popelings.

Ann. Do. 801 Thus doth he write: *Romani, qui ab imperatore Constantinopolitano iam diu animo desciuerant, nunc accepta occasionis opportunitate, quia mulier (excæcato imperatore Constantino filio suo) eis imperabat, vno omnium consensu Carolo regi imperatorias laudes acclamant, eumque per manũ Leonis Papæ coronant, Cæsarem*

Cæsarem & Augustum appellant; Pipinum verò filium eius regem Italiæ ordinatum collaudant.

The Romanes, who a long time had in mind and affection reuolted from the Emperour of *Constantinople*, seeing now a fit occasion offered them, because a woman did gouerne them, her son the Emperour *Constantine* being made blind, did all with one consent sound out imperiall and royall acclamations to king *Charles*, calling him *Cæsar* and *Augustus*, and crowning him by the hand of *Leo* the Pope: yea they collaud his son *Pipine* made king of *Italie*.

Out of these woords I wish the Reader, to obserue these important points with me.

1 First, that 800. yeeres after Christs sacred birth, the Bishops of Rome were subiect to the Emperour, as their owne deere Monke *Sigebert* telleth them; and as you haue heard already, Pope *Gregorie* acknowledged his fealty to *Mauritius* the Emperour, in the yeere 603.

2 Secondly, that the Pope and people of Rome endeuoured a long time, to shake off the yoke of obedience to the Emperour, and in the yeere 801. put the same in execution.

3 Thirdly, that the translation of the Empire implied flatte treason, in the Pope and all his Romish Popelings. For as Frier *Sigebert* telleth vs, they surrendred vp the right of their soueraigne to an other man: and hence commeth it, that the Iesuiticall Cardianll *Bellarmine* appealeth to the law of perscription, affirming titles gotten by robberie, to be lawfull by that meanes. And indeede by stealth and robberie, it may well beseeme a Iesuite, to iustifie popish late start vp regalitie.

4 Fourthly, that the Bishop of Rome is not the true and lawfull king of Italie: for the Papists doe not agree in their assertions, touching this counterfeit regalitie of their Popes. *Blandus* and *Platina* write, that *Pipine* gaue the exerchate of Rauenna and Pentapolis to *Gregorie*; *Regino* referreth the donation to *Steuen*; and *Sigebert* saith here, that *Pipine* in the yeere 801. had it in his owne pos-

session still. Yea, the same *Sigebert* saith further, that in the yeere 812. the Emperour *Charles* imposed the imperiall Crowne vpon the head of his sonne *Lewis*, and made *Bernard* sonne of *Pipine* the King of Italie. But doubtlesse if *Pipine* were King of Italie in the yeere 851. and *Bernard* King thereof in the yeere 812. I see not how the Pope was
A.D.727. then, or that is now, any King at all. And therefore wee may credite *Bellarmine* at leasure, when hee telleth vs out of *Ado*, that king *Pipine* gaue Reuenna and all Pentapolis to Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul*: but it is well, that S. *Paul* is become coheire with Saint *Peter*. For by his meanes, other Bishops must haue as great a share, as the Bishops of Rome: there the Reader must not forget, what Frier *Sige-*
A.D.805. *bert* telleth vs of *Charles* the great, after that hee was inthronized in the Empire. These are his expresse wordes; *Carolus imperator, &c.* *Charles* the Emperor, when the Emperours of Constantinople had indignation against him, for the name of Emperour giuen him by the Romanes; suffered them with great patience and magnanimitye: And because hee was afraide of their mighty power, with often Ambassages hee procured them to bee his deere friends: yet our Iesuit *Bellamine* would haue vs to beleeue, that the Emperours of Constantinople did freely graunt, that the Pope and the Romanes had full right to translate the Empire; but their owne deere friend (as wee see heere,) affirmeth the contrary for a truth. Yea, both
Vide Ar. Pontac. fol. 122. *Blandus* and *Platina* affirme very constantly, that *Charles* did agree first with the Empresse *Irene*, and after with the Emperour *Nicephorus*, that hee with their fauours might rule ouer the West.

The seuenth steppe, was the constitution of the electors of the future Emperour. For *Gregorie* the fift being
Vide Phill. p. Bergomens. p. 277. Antoninus 3. par. tit. 22. ca. 5. §. 13. a Germane borne, and a neere kinsman to *Otho* the Emperour at that time, did by his fauour and free graunt, appoint seauen electors of the Empire for euer. *viz.* the Archbishop of Men z, the Archbishop of Treuerse, the Archbishop of Colen, the marques of Brandenburgh, the countie

tie Palatine, the Duke of Saxonie, and the King of Bohemia. This godly constitution was enacted by the Pope and Emperour, (being both of them not only Germanes but also kinsmen) that the Empire might bee established in their posteritie, and their bloud thereby aduanced for euer. A.D. 994.

The eight and highest step of this ladder, did reach vp euen to the highest heauen, and to the very throne of our Lord Iesus. For the Pope hauing now enlarged his soueraigntie, by little and little, from steppe to steppe: was neither abased nor afraide to challenge the authority and royall right of both swordes throughout the Christian world: for hee made a flat decree for the confirmation thereof, as is euident by the extrauagant of *Boniface* the eight, (*vnam sanctam, de maioritate & obedientia*) set downe in the sixt Booke of the decretals. And as *Gratianus* reporteth, Pope *Nicholas* taught the same doctrine: these are the expresse words, *Christus beato Petro aterne vite clauigero, terreni simul & celestis imperij iura commisit.* A.D. 1294. Dest. 22. can. omnes.

Christ commited to Saint *Peter* that beareth the keyes of eternall life, the right both of earthly and heauenly Empire. And the glosse which the Popes parasites haue annexed to this decree, hath these very words: *Argumentum quod Papa habet vtrunq; gladium, & spiritualem & temporalem.* An argument, that the Pope hath both the swords, aswell the spirituall as the temporall. And in the marginall note, it is there set downe, *Papa habens vtrunq; gladium, transtulit imperium:* the Pope hauing both swordes, translated the Empire. And *appendix Fuldensis* vnfoldeth this cursed decree, in these most plaine tearmes: Gloss. F. celest.

Hic Papa (Bonifacius 8.) constitutionem fecerat, in qua se dominum spiritualem & temporalem in vniuerso mundo asserebat. Vnde requisiuit Phillippum regem Francia, vt a se regnum suum cognosceret, quod Rex facere contempsit. Appendix Fuldensis.

This Pope (hee speaketh of *Boniface* the eight) made a constitution, in which hee affirmed himselfe, to bee both spirituall and temporall Lord in the whole world. Where-

vpon hee would haue had *Phillip* King of France, to haue acknowledged his kingdome from him: which thing the King scorned to doe.

Since this ladder was thus framed, the Bishops of Rome haue tyrannized aboue measure in the world, and taking vpon them that authoritie which pertaineth to God alone, they haue disposed of Kings and Kingdomes, translated royall diademes, tyrannized ouer mens soules, and trodden all sacred soueraigntie vnder foot. For, that Popish canons ascribe plaine diuine titles to the Pope, it cannot possibly be denyed, because in the Popes owne decretals, I find these expresse wordes; *Sic (Papa) dicitur habere cæleste arbitrium, & ideo etiam naturam rerum immutat, substantiam vnius rei applicando alij; & de nihilo potest aliquid facere.* So the Pope is said to haue celestiall arbitriment, and therefore doth hee alter the nature of things, applying the substantiall parts of one thing to another; and so can make of nothing something. Thus the Papists write of their Pope, and hee is well pleased therewith. And yet the truth is, that as man can in some cases at sometime make one thing of an other; so in all cases at all times, to make some thing of nothing, is proper to God alone.

Gloß. lib. 1. decret; tit. 7. ca. 3

The Popes parasites write thus of his power in generall; *Sicut non est potestas nisi à deo, sic nec aliqua temporalis vel ecclesiastica, imperialis vel regalis, nisi à Papa; in cuius fœmore scripsit Christus, rex regum, dominus dominantium.* Like as there is no power but of God, so is there neither any temporall nor ecclesiasticall, neither imperiall nor regall, but of the Pope; in whose thigh Christ hath written, the King of kings, and Lord of lords. Loe here gentle Reader, two things are proper to God alone; the one, to be King of kings, and Lord of lords; the other, to be the author of all power: both which you see here ascribed to the Pope.

Gerf. de potest. eccles. consider. 12. part. 3.

The Pope himselfe from his own pen, *Gregorie* the ninth, deliuereth vs this doctrine, *Ad firmamentum cæli, hoc est, vniuersalis ecclesiæ, fecit deus duo magna luminaria, id est, duas*

Greg. 9, libr. 1 de. r. tit. 33. cap. 6.

institui

instituit dignitates, quæ sunt pontificalis authoritas, & regalis potestas sequitur; vt quanta est inter solem & lunam, tanta inter pontifices & reges differentia cognoscatur. To the Firmament of heauen, that is of the vniuersall church, God made two lights, pontificall authority, and power royall: that we may know there is as much difference betweene popes and kings, as there is betweene the Sunne and the Moone. The Glosse setteth downe precisely, how farre a King is inferiour to a pope, that is, to any bishoppe of *Rome*, in these wordes; *Restat, vt pontificalis dignitas, quadragesies septies sit maior regali dignitate.* It remaineth, that the dignitie of the pope, is forty times seauen times greater than the power of the King. *Gloss. ibid.*

Now touching the kissing of the popes feete, I answere, that some christian kings and emperors vpon a blinde zeale not grounded in knowledge, humbling themselues to the bishop of *Rome*, and yeelding vp their soueraigne rights to him, opened the window to all antichristian tyranny. For in short time after, (as is already prooued) the Romish bishops became so lordly and insolent, that they tooke vppon them to depose the Emperours, to translate their Empires, and to dispose at their pleasures of their royall Scepters and Regalities. Much more might be saide in this matter, but for that the pope hath made it sacriledge to dispute of this, I will heere onely tell thee, gentle Reader, what the popes deere Frier *Sigebertus* hath written of his holinesse. These are his expresse wordes; *Vt pace omnium bonorum dixerim, hæc sola nouitas, non dicam hæresis, nondum in mundo emerserat, vt sacerdotes illius, qui regnare facit hypocrita propter peccata populi, doceant populum quod malis regibus nullam debeant subiectionem, & licet ei sacramentum fidelitatis fecerint, nullam tamen debeant fidelitatem, nec periuri dicantur, qui contra regem senserint; imò qui regi paruerit, pro excommunicato habeatur; qui contra regem fecerit, noxa iniustitiæ & periurij absoluatur.* To speake by the fauour of all good men, this sole noueltie, I will not say heresie, was not yet knowne in the world; that his prieste who maketh an hypocrite *Sigebert. in anno, 1088.*

to reigne for the sinnes of the people, should teach the people, that they owe no subiection to wicked kings; and that although they haue taken the othe of fealtie, yet doe they owe them no allegeance, neyther are they periured that thinke ill against the King: yea, hee that obeyeth the King, is this day reputed an excommunicate person; and hee that taketh parte against the King, is absolued from the crime of iniustice and periurie.

This is our very case (gentle Reader) this day in *England*, so liuelie painted out in best beseeming colours, as if the Writer had beene liuing euen now amongst vs. So then, wee haue to obserue heere for our instruction, That the Popes owne Monkes and Friers haue thought as ill of the popes dealings in former times, as wee thinke of his proceedings in these latter dayes: As also, That popish religion hath alwaies beene condemned, euen of great learned papistes that liued in the popes Church. Whereof none can be ignorant, that will seriously peruse my Bookes of *Motiues* and *Surney*. And this shall suffice for the first Article: to which (if their hearts doe not faint them, or their consciences condemne them) the papists will frame some answer vndoubtedly.

Answere 8 Papists if you can: if not, repent for shame.

The

The ſecond Article, touching the erroneous doctrine of the Popiſh Maſſe.

The firſt member. Of the impoſsibility of their ſuppoſed reall preſence.

AQuinas, the Ieſuite *Bellarmine*, the Councell of *Trent*, *Melchior Canus*, *Ioſephus Angles*, and the reſt of the Romiſh broode, holde conſtantly as an article of their Chriſtian faith, That the true, organicall and naturall body of Chriſt Ieſus, which was borne of the Virgin *Marie*, which was crucified and nayled on the Croſſe, which roſe agayne the third day from death, and is circumſcriptiuely and locally in heauen, is alſo truely, really, and ſubſtantially, vnder the forme of bread and wine, in the ſacrifice of the popiſh maſſe. But this is impoſſible, as which implieth flat contradiction; and conſequently, late Romiſh religion conſiſteth of impoſſibilities, falſhoodes, and contradictions. The doubt heereof is onely in the aſſumption; for proofe whereof, I ſet downe this ſuppoſall with out Cardinall *Bellarmine*, *viz.* That wee are not bound to beleeue any thing which implyeth contradiction. And becauſe I will proceede ſincerely, yee ſhall heare his owne words: thus doth hee write; *Neq; fides noſtra ad id nos obligat, vt ea defendamus, quæ euidenter implicant contradictionem.* Neyther dooth our faith binde vs ſo, that wee muſt defend thoſe things which imply euident contradiction. But ſo it is, that the popiſh imaginarie beeing of Chriſts body in a little

Conc. trid. ſeſſ. 3. can. 1. Aquin. 3 p. q. 76. art. 1.

Ioſeph Angles in 4. 1. p. q. 4. de euchar.

Bellar. de euch libr. 1. cap. 2. col. 468. B.

Bellar. de euchar. lib. 3. cap. 19. col. 748. A.

little round cake, implieth in it selfe euident contradiction, and cannot possibly be brought to passe. For example, no power vpon earth, or in heauen, can bring to passe, that a bodie being three cubites long, and one cubite broad, remaining still so long, and so broade, shall be contained in another bodie of two cubites length, and halfe a cubite breadth. The reason heereof is euident, because so to containe, and be so contained, implieth flat contradiction. And this is the case now in controuersie, concerning Christs supposed being in the round popish Cake. For if Christs naturall and organicall bodie be there, as popish faith auoucheth: then must the Papistes beleeue euident contradictions, contrary to Iesuite *Bellarmines* resolution; yea, contrarie to all Power, all Logicke, all Reason. All the papists in *England* are not able to solue this reason. I challenge them all, and aduise them to consult together, and to craue helpe of their friends elsewhere, and then to let me haue their speedy answer hereunto.

Aquin. 3. p. q. 76. art. 4. contra.

Apud Joseph. Angles, in 4. sect. 1. p. pag. 144.

Cardinall *Caietane* affirmeth boldely, that no text in the whole Gospel dooth prooue effectually, and conuince the Reader to vnderstand these wordes properly (This is my body.) For which respect Frier *Ioseph* aduiseth grauely, to reade their Cardinall (*caute*) warily.

Aquinas in 4. s. d. 10. q. 2. art. 1.

Aquinas affirmeth constantly, *Corpus Christi non esse in pluribus locis simul, secundum proprias dimensiones*; That Christs body is not in many places at once, according to the proper dimensions thereof: whose assertion is my flatte position. For Christs naturall body cannot be without those dimensions which naturally pertaine vnto it. *Durandus* holdeth the very same opinion.

Aug. epist. ad Dardan. in fine.

S. *Austine* sayth plainely, that Christs true body can bee but in one onely place of heauen. *Vbi totum presentem esse non dubites tanquam deum, & in eodem templo dei esse tanquam inhabitantem deum, & in loco aliquo cœli propter veri corporis modum.* Thou must not doubt (sayth S. *Austen*) that Christ is wholly present euery where as God, and in the same temple of God, as God inhabiting it, and in some one place of

of heauen, for the manner of a true body. Lo, this graue father telleth vs, that Christ as God is euery where; but yet in respect of his true body, hee is onely in heauen, and in some certaine place of heauen. Only in heauen, because the Scripture saith, That he shall be there till the worldes end, in some certaine place of heauen, to declare the nature and veritie of a true body indeede. So then, if hee were present as the Papists would haue him, his bodie should lose the nature and veritie of a true bodie indeed.

Againe in another place S. *Austen* hath these words; *Donec seculum finiatur, sursum est dominus, sed tamen etiam hic nobiscum est veritas domini; corpus enim in quo resurrexit, in vno loco esse oportet; veritas autem eius vbique diffusa est.* Our Lord is aboue vntill the worldsend, but yet his truth is with vs here; for the body of our Lord, wherein he rose againe, must needs bee in one place; but this truth is diffused euery where. *Aug. de con: secr. dist. 2. can. prima quidem.*

Againe, the same S. *Austen* writing against *Faustus* the Manichee, hath these expresse words: *Secundum presentiam corporalem, simul & in Sole, & in Luna, & in cruce esse non posset.* According to his corporall presence, it was not possible for him to be both in the Sunne, and in the Moone, and on the crosse, at one and the same time. O Papists answere if you can; if not, recant for shame. *Aug. contr. Faust lib. 20. ca. 11. to. 6.*

The second Member. Of the Sacrifice of the Popish Masse.

THe Papists teach and beleeue as an article of Christian faith, That in their Masse Christs true and reall body is truly and really sacrificed to God the Father, vnder the forme of bread, as also his true and reall bloud vnder the forme of wine. Yet this implyeth horrible impiety and brutish cruelty, as shall be prooued: and consequently, popish Masse is to be abhorred. *Conc. trid. sess. 6. can. 2. die 17. sep. Bellar. lib. 2. cap. 12. Aquin. 3. p. q. 82. art. 4.*

Rom. 6. v. 9. First, where the Apostle telleth vs, that Christ rising agayne from the dead, henceforth dieth no more, because death hath no more dominion ouer him; the papistes tell vs a contrary tale, that Christ dyeth euery day, nay, a thousand times a day, in the dayly sacrifice of their Masse: for with them all priests (the Pope, Cardinalles, and some others excepted) doe ordinarily say Masse euery day, and three Masses vpon euery Christmas day. Which being so, and three hundred Iesuites and Seminarie Priestes being this day in *England* and *Scotland*, as the Iesuites tell vs; an huge multitude of Masses must be sayde daily in these realmes, and many times must Christ be put to death, so farre foorth as in them lyeth, though they pretend to honour him thereby.

Note this reason. For, as Cardinall *Bellarmine* graunteth freely, a sacrifice implyeth intrinsecally, the consumption of the thing that is sacrificed. I will not auouch any vntruth vpon any man (gentle Reader) these are his owne words; *Sacrificium enim preter oblationem, requirit mutationem, & consumptionem rei quæ offertur*. For, saith *Bellarmine*, a sacrifice besides the oblation, requires an alteration and a consumption of the thing which is offered.

Bellar. de miß. lib. 1. cap. 2. col. 957.

Vbi sup. col. 697. Againe, *Bellarmine* in another place telleth vs, that the body and bloud of Christ are offered in the Masse, *verè & propriè*, truely and properly, vnder the formes of bread and wine.

Vbi sup. col. 1015. Againe, *Bellarmine* sayth in another place, that flesh and bloud are not fit for meate, *nisi prius animal moriatur*, vnlesse the beast first die (and be slaine.)

Bellar. de miß. lib. 1. cap. vlt. Againe, the same *Bellarmine* teacheth the same doctrine, yet more plainely in another place. Thus dooth hee write: *Sacrificium enim verum & reale, veram & realem occisionem exigit, quando in occisione ponitur essentia sacrificij*. For a true and reall sacrifice requireth a true and reall killing, seeing that the essence of the sacrifice consisteth in the killing therof. And in very deede, this is that constant doctrine which S. *Paul* doth inculcate to the Hebrews.

Heb. 9. v. 17, 25, 26, 27, 28.

So

So then, wee see it cleere and euident by popish faith and doctrine, that Iesus Christ our sweete redeemer, must first be killed, then offered, lastly torne and consumed by the teeth of the sacrificing Masse-priest; or else the popish masse cannot be perfect, as their most perfect doctour telleth vs.

For confirmation of this popish doctrine, it is a constant position, and generally receiued axiome in the popish Church, that by vertue of their consecratory wordes, Christs bodie is put aparte from his bloud, and his bloud apart from his bodie; and so Christ is there slaine by force of their consecration, though he still liue indeede, because the Priests words haue not so much force as they imagine. You shall heare *Bellarmines* owne wordes, *Nam imprimis ideo in cœna seorsim consecratur corpus, & seorsim sanguis, vt intelligamus presentiam corporis & sanguinis in cœna, esse admodum occisi & mortui corporis*. For first, therefore is the body consecrate apart in the supper, and the bloud asunder, that wee may vnderstand the presence of the bodie and bloud in the supper, to be there after the manner of a body slaine and dead. These are his wordes, and this which hee thus deliuereth, is the constant doctrine of the popish Church. Whereupon it followeth of necessitie, that if anie Papist should haue said Masse, *in triduo mortis Christi*, during Christs death; then Christs body by vertue thereof should haue beene dead in one place, and his bloud in another place: for otherwise, Christ should haue beene both quicke and dead at once, which implyeth contradiction. *Aquinas* graunteth this illation, these are his words: *Ideo si in illo triduo mortis fuisset hoc sacramentum celebratum, non fuisset ibi anima Christi.* Therefore during Christs death, if this sacrament had beene celebrated, the soule of Christ should not haue been in it.

Bellar. de miss. lib. 1. ca. 12. col. 1015. 6.

Aquin. 3. p. q. 76. art. 1.

Secondly, if this popish kind of doctrine were true, these absurdities and grosse impieties must perforce follow hereupon, *viz.* that Christ the night before he was crucified, was both sitting at the table, and borne in his owne

handes, both liuing and dead, both visible and inuisible, both long and short, both broad and narrow, both light and heauie; that hee was a sacrifice for our sinnes, before he dyed for our sinnes, that his sacrifice was eyther vnperfect in the former oblation in his last supper, or els that it was needlesse in his bitter immolation vppon the Altar of
Hebr.9.v.27. the Crosse. For as the Apostle teacheth vs, Christ was not to offer himselfe often, as the high Priest did, but once to the destruction of sinne, by the sacrifice of himselfe. These are his words, as the Papists (our English Remists I meane) haue put them downe; and as it is appointed to men to dye once, and after this the iudgement: so also Christ was offered once, to exhaust the sinnes of many. Loe, Christ dyed but once; and that one oblation was sufficient to take away all sinnes in the world. The word (exhaust) which the Remists vse, doth significantly expresse so much. But the words of S. *Paul* in another place are most manifest, and doe plainely conuince this truth:
Hebr.10.v.10 In the which will (saith S. *Paul*) we are made holy, euen by the offering of the bodie of Iesus Christ once for all.
ibid.v.12. Againe thus: But this man, after hee hath offered one sacrifice for sinnes, is set downe for euer on the right hand
ibid.v.14. of God. Againe in these words: For with one offering hath hee made perfect for euer them that are sanctified. Loe, gentle Reader, Christ, saith Christs Apostle, made but one oblation: Christ, say the Papists, hath made many, and still maketh moe oblations. Christ, saith Christs Apostle, dyed but once on the Crosse: Christ, say the Papists, dyeth euery day in the Masse. Christ, saith Christs Apostle, made perfect, finished, and consummated mans redemption, with one onely sacrifice. Christ, say the Papists, doth perfect and consummate his, with the daily sacrifice of the Masse. Now whether Christs Apostle, or our Papists be of better credit, let the indifferent Reader iudge.
Luk.22.v.20. Thirdly, the Cup is the newe Testament in my bloud
Hebr.9.v.17. saith Christ, which is shed for you. But a Testament is not of force without the death of the Testator, as S. *Paul* teacheth

cheth vs. And consequently either Christs bodie was not really offered in his supper, or at least it was a sacrifice of no force, value, or efficacie, at all; for that it was not yet ratified by the death of the testator. Hereupon it followeth of necessitie, that when Christ saith in S. *Luke*. This cup is the new Testament in my bloud: and in S. *Mathew*, This is my bloud of the new Testament: the sence is all one, most plaine, and cleare, *viz.* that the Cup is a sacrament of the bloud of Christ, and of the new Testament confirmed thereby; but indeede is no more really the bloud of Christ it selfe, than it is really the new Testament it selfe. For the expresse mention of remission of sinnes, is referred to the bloud of Christ shed vpon the Crosse, and not to the sacrament of his bloud; seeing his bloud was not shed in his supper, but his bitter passion.

Luk. 12. *v.* 20. Mat. 26. *v.* 18

Fourthly, the Apostle saith flatly, οὐκ ἔτι προσφορὰ περὶ ἁμαρτίας there is not henceforth any oblation for sinne. But if S. *Paule* say truly, that there is no oblation for sinne, after Christs death on the Crosse; then doubtlesse the Papists must needes say falsely, that they haue a dayly propitiatorie Sacrifice in their popish Masse. Neither will it serue their turne to answere, that it is the selfe-same sacrifice of the Crosse, but offered in another manner; for if that were true, then should their Masse-sacrifice be of infinite value: which for all that, no Papist dareth auouch. Nay, *Bellarmine* saith in plaine tearmes: *Valor sacrificij missæ finitus est.* The value or worth of the Masse, is finit, not infinit. And yet, if the value of the Masse bee not infinit, then doubtlesse, that sacrifice cannot bee the sonne of God, for he is of infinite power, of infinit Maiestie, of infinit value. Yea, whosoeuer denieth Christs bodie and bloud, subsisting in the person of God by hypostaticall vnion, to bee of infinite value, hee is become a flat Arrian, beleeuing Christ to be pure man, and not God. And consequently, the Papists, howsoeuer they thinke or speake of their Masse, yet making it a sacrifice, they must perforce bee blasphemous against the sonne of God. Againe, *Bellarmine*

Heb. 10. *v.* 18

Bellar. de miss. lib. 2. *cap.* 4. *col.* 1076.

confesseth against himselfe vnawares, and against an article of popish faith, That their popish masse is not *verè & proprè*, truly and properly propitiarie: *Quod Christus nunc immortalis, nec mereri, nec satisfacere potest.* Because, saith *Bellarmine*, Christ now being immortall, can neither merit nor satisfie. But I am well assured, that their holy late counsell of Trent teacheth otherwise. These are the words: *Et quoniam in diuino hoc sacrificio, quod in missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, & incruentè immolatur, qui in ara crucis semel seipsum cruentè obtulit, docet sancta synodus sacrificium istud verè propitiatorium esse.* And because in this diuine sacrifice which is made in the masse, that same Christ is contained, and offered vnbloudily, who on the altar of the crosse once offered himselfe bloudily, the holy councell teacheth it to be a propitiatorie sacrifice truly and indeede. Loe, how the Papists say and vnsay: one while it is truely a propitiatorie sacrifice; another while it cannot truely bee so called. Well, the Pope hath allowed *Bellarmines* doctrine, and he hath also allowed the Counsell; and yet wise men can see how they flatly disagree, and that in the highest point of their melodie.

Bellar. de missa. lib. 2. cap. 4. col. 1076.

Con. trid. sess. 6 can. 2. de. 17 sep.

Fiftly, the Popes owne decrees doe seale vp this truth against the Pope, these are his words: *Sicut ergo cœlestis panis qui Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum reuera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius viz. quod visibile, quod palpabile, mortale, in cruce positum est; vocatur q3 ipso immolatio carnis quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio mors crucifixio; non rei veritate sed significante mysterio; sic sacrum fidei quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est.* As therfore the heauenly bred, which is the flesh of Christ, is after it maner called the body of Christ, when indeed it is the Sacrament of Christs bodie, of that body which is visible, which is palpable, mortall, & nailed on the crosse: & that oblation of flesh which is made by the hands of the priest, is called Christs passion, death, crucifixion, not in the truth of the thing, but in a mysterie, which signifieth the thing: so the sacrament of faith, by which baptisme is vnderstood, is faith.

De consecrat. dist. 2. can. hec est.

Thus

Thus saith the text. Let vs now heare their owne glosse vpon the same text, these are the expresse words: *Cœleste sacramentum quod verè representat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed improprie, vnde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio: vt sit sensus, vocatur Christi corpus, id est, significatur.* The heauenly sacrament which representeth Christs flesh truly, is called the bodie of Christ, but vnproperly, wherefore it is said, *suo modo*, after it manner, but not in the truth of the thing, but in the mysterie of the thing signified: that this may be the sence, it is called Christs bodie, that is to say, it signifieth his bodie.

Out of these golden words, deliuered as God would haue it by the pens of papists, to the confusion of all papists, I note first, that the holy and blessed bread of the Eucharist or Lords supper, is called the bodie of Christ. Secondly, that it is also called the passion and death of Christ. Thirdly, that it is not Christs bodie truly, properly, and in the truth of the thing. Fourthly, that it is Christs body, as the sacrament of baptisme is faith. Fiftly, that it is not Christs bodie in truth, but in signification. Sixtly, that it is onely called Christs bodie, because it is the sacrament of his body; as baptisme is called faith, being only the sacrament of faith. Seuenthly, that it is Christs bodie, *improprè, suo modo significati mysterio*; improperly, after a sort, in the mysterie of the thing signified: which words must be wel remembred and marked. Lastly, that it is saide negatiuely, *non rei veritate*: it is not Christs bodie, in truth, in deede, or in the veritie of the thing. These wordes are the very vpshot of the controuersie, they can admit no solution. For if Christs bodie were in the sacrament really and substantially, with bodie, flesh, bloud, sinewes, bones and quantitie, as the papists say and beleeue; then doubtlesse hee should be there *in rei veritate*, in the truth of the thing, euen in that true bodie which was borne of the blessed Virgin, the true Mother of true GOD, and true man. Answere Papists, if ye can, or else come home, and yeelde to the truth for shame.

The third Member. Of the barbarous and plaine villanous proceeding against Berengarius, for denial of the abouenamed popish sacrifice.

Popish decrees tell vs a long tale of one *Berengarius* sometime Deacon of a Church in Gaunt, who held a doctrine surely grounded vpon the holy scriptures, but wholy opposite to the late popish faith; *viz.* That the bread and wine in the holy Eucharist, after Christs words vttered, which they call consecration; are onely the sacrament, and not the true bodie and blood of our Lord Iesus Christ; and that they cannot sensuallie or sensibly, (for so their owne word *sensualiter* signifieth) bee handled or broken with the hands of the priests, or torne with the teeth of the faithfull. For this opinion so setled vpon Gods word, as all the cursed Romish brood, are not able in truth to gainesay the same; Pope *Nicholas* with his Romish synod, did so cruelly proceede against the sillie deacon, as hee must needes either abiure and renounce the truth, or else betake himselfe to bee burnt with popish fire and faggot out of hand. In regard whereof, the poore Deacon ouercome with humane frailtie, yeelded at least in shew of wordes, to their most wicked, cruell, and very barbarous, or rather villanous suggestion. Then the Pope and Councell set downe the forme of wordes, which he should pronounce, the summe whereof I haue alreadie alleaged: who as list may reade the words at large, in the place quoted in the margent. I omit the words, because they are long and tedious: onely I wish the reader to obserue seriously with me, (for this reason can neuer bee answered till the worlds end) that it is an article of popish faith, (oh horrible blasphemie) That the true and reall body of the Sonne of God, which was borne of the virgin *Marie*, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father omnipotent and all sufficient, is torne in pieces with the teeth

De consecrat. dist. 2. can. Ego Berengarius.

teeth of the faithfull, and broken a sunder with the hands of the Priest, in their idolatrous Masse. For these are the words of the Popish sinod; *Manibus sacerdotum frangi, & fidelium dentibus atteri.* Which words are so fully farced with blasphemie, and repugnant to the truth, that neyther *Melchior Canus*, nor the popish glosse, nor *Bellarmine*, can tell how to shuffle vp the same, but with shame inough, they passe it ouer as they can. *Bellarmine*, who is as it were the Popes owne mouth, writeth in this manner; *Respondeo, nunquam fuisse quæstionem, an Christi corpus vere vt est in se, frangeretur manibus, & dentibus tereretur; certum enim est, & semper fuit, Christi corpus incorruptibile nunc existens, non posse frangi & teri, nisi in signo siue sacramento: ita vt dicatur frangi ac teri, cum signum eius, id est, species panis frangitur, & teritur.* I answere (saith the Iesuite) that question was neuer made, if the body of Christ as it is in it selfe, were truely broken with hands, and torne with teeth: for it is and euer was certaine and sure, that Christs body being now incorruptible, cannot be broken and torne, saue onely in a signe or sacrament; so as it may be said to be broken and torne, when the signe thereof, that is to say, the forme of bread is broken and torne. Bellar. de con. lib. 2. cap. 8. d

Out of these words I note first, that by the Popes owne doctrine, (for the Iesuites doctrine is the doctrine of the Pope, seeing the Pope hath approued it,) Christs bodie cannot bee broken or torne truely and indeede. I note secondly, that the Pope and his councell decreede the contrary doctrine, and that as an article of Popish faith; when they compelled *Berengarius*, to confesse it with his mouth, and to beleeue it with his heart, and did also publish the same, *per vrbes Italiæ, Germaniæ, & Galliæ*, through the cities of Italie, France, and Germanie: for so saith the decree, *Ego Berengarius.* I none thirdly, that it is truely said, Christs body is broken; becausse the forme of the bread is broken, as Popish doctrine teacheth vs. For wee see here, that this is all that the Papists can say for themselues: and vpon this strong foundation, and in-

uincible bulwarke, I inferre this golden and euident corollarie; *viz.* That if it be true to say, Christs body is broken and torne, because the signe of his body is broken and torne; then truely may wee say, and truely doe wee say, that Christs bodie is in the Eucharist, because the signe of his body is there, because the sacrament of his body is there, because the representation of his body is there. And much more truely might Christ himselfe say, This is my body, when hee gaue the signe and sacrament of his body. I note fourthly, that it is the constant doctrine of the church of England (which also many other reformed churches approoue therein) that Christs body is receiued, broken, torne and consumed with mouth and teeth, figuratiuely, significantly, mystically, sacramentally. And consequently, if the Papists would be iudged by this doctrine, which by the pen of the Iesuit *Bellarmine* they heere deliuer, the controuersie would soone be at an end. But I must needs tell the reader what the Popes owne glosse teacheth vs: it is singular and worthy to bee noted, these are the words. *Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarij, in maiorem incides hæresim, quam ipse habuit; & ideo omnia referas ad species ipsas, nam de corpore Christi partes non facimus.* Vnlesse thou vnderstand the words of *Berengarius* soundly, thou shalt fall into a greater heresie than he had; and therefore thou must referre all things to the formes, for of Christs body wee make no parts. Marke these words, gentle reader, for they are important: They teach vs plainely, that it is a most dangerous thing to relye vpon popish decrees, euen then when they pretend to reforme the Church, and to condemne heresies.

Gl. in Decr. de Cons. dist. 2. cap. ego Berengarius.

S. *Awsten* confirmeth the doctrine, which the Pope compelled *Berengarius* to abiure, and that in many places of his workes; one onely assertion I will now set downe. These are his wordes: *Illi manducabant panem dominũ; ille panem domini contra dominũ.* They (the other Apostles) ate the bread that was the Lord, he (*Iudas*) ate (not our Lord, but) the bread of our Lord, against our Lord.

Aug. in Ioan. tract. 59.

Note

Note these words, gentle Reader, and marke them seriously. Saint *Austen* telleth vs, that the bread which the other Apostles ate, was our Lord; yet that which *Iudas* receiued, was but the bread of the Lord. This assertion confoundeth the Papists. For, if our Lord and maker be present really, in flesh, bloud, and bone, vnder the accidents of bread; and that so long as the same accidents remaine vncorrupt, as the popish faith holdeth: then doubtlesse *Iudas* should haue receiued his redeemer; then perforce *Iudas* should also haue receiued *panem dominum*; then *Iudas* could not by any possibility haue barely receiued *panem domini*, which yet S. *Austen* affirmeth most constantly. For first, if it were true, that after popish supposed consecration, the substance of bread were transubstantiated into Christs naturall bodie, as it truly consisteth of flesh, bloud, and bone: and againe, if it were also true, that the selfesame body remained vnder the forme of bread, vntill it were corrupted, then let all the Papists in England, with the best aduise of all their adherents and brother Papists elsewhere in Europe, tell me how *Innas* could receiue (*panem domini*) the bread of our Lord, and not *panem dominum* the bread which is the Lord, as S. *Austen* plainely auoucheth, that is, how *Iudas* could receiue the forme, with the flesh, bloud, and bones, of Christs organicall and naturall body hidden vnder the same; and for all that, not receiue Christ himselfe, and *panem dominum*, as the other Apostles did. Let them I say, tell mee this, and I herewith promise to subscribe, & neuer henceforth to write against them, or any part of their popish doctrine. If they will not this doe, because they cannot (for if they can doe it, all the world must thinke they will doe it, for their owne credit, and the credit of their cause) then doubtlesse, if the feare of God bee before their eyes, they will acknowledge the truth, and with open mouth confesse the same. *Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam, & ore confessio fit ad salutem.* Rom. 10. v. 10.

The fourth Member. Of the apparant contradictions in the Popish masse.

FIrst, the Papists tell vs, that Christs body in their Masse, is the selfe same bodye that was nailed on the Crosse. And withall they tell vs, that it is a figure of the same body. That it is a flatte contradiction, their owne deere Cardinall *Bellarmine* shall tell them: These are his words; *Figuræ necessario inferiores esse debent rebus figuratis.* Figures of necessitie, must needs bee inferiour to the things figured by them. And this doctrine is most true indeede, as Saint *Paul* discourseth to the Hebrewes. Now would I know of the Papists, if they can say ought for the life of their masse, how Christs body in the masse beeing the selfe same body *numero*, as they teach and beleeue, can be inferiour to Christs bodie on the Crosse; how it can be both inferiour and superiour to it selfe; how it can be both of greater and lesser value than Christs body on the crosse, being euer the selfe same body on the crosse.

Bellar. de Eucharist. lib. 1, cap. 3. col. 474.

Heb. 10.

Secondly, the Papists tell vs, that Christs naturall bodye is contained in a little rounde cake, or vnder the accidents and forme of bread. Now would I knowe of the same Papists, how the bigger can bee contained of the lesser, how a bushell can be couched in a pecke, how a great Oxe can be closed vp in little Calues bellie. For all these implie euident contradiction.

Bellar. de Eucharist. lib. 1. cap. 2. col. 472.

Thirdly, the Papists tell vs, that christs bodye is truely broken. For these are the Iesuit *Bellarmines* words: *Deniq; in concilio Romano sub Nicholao 2. compulsus est Berengarius confiteri, Christi corpus sensualiter sacerdotum manibus tangi & frangi.*. Finally, in a counsell at Rome vnder Pope *Nicholas* the second, *Berengarius* was compelled to confesse, that christs body is sensually touched and broken with the Priests hands.

Now would I know, how it can bee true, that christs body

bodie is broken, and also true, that it is not broken, speaking of the same bodie at the same time. Let all papists answere, and tell me if they can, how it implieth not contradiction. For to say, that not the bodie, but the accident of bread is broken, is too too childish and friuolous. The reason is euident, because *Berengarius* (ô cruell impietie) was compelled to confesse, that Christs bodie was sensually broken.

Fourthly, the Papists tell vs, that the pronouncing of these words by a Priest (This is my bodie) doe make Christs bodie present in their Masse, and also in other places: insomuch (marke well gentle Reader what I say) that if a popish priest come into a great market place, where there is great store of wheat bread, though a thousand or moe loaues in number, and there looking on the bread, shall pronounce the sayd wordes, with intention to consecrate, then forthwith euerie loafe is God almightie, and the people must adore the same. Tryall heereof was once made *de facto* in Italie, as my selfe being in Rome, heard from the mouth of a Iesuit. For, as the Iesuit reported, a priest being degraded and designed to die, as hee passed in the streete by a Bakers house, beheld a great quantitie of wheat bread, recited these wordes (*Hoc est corpus meum*) and told the people, that hee had consecrated the sayd bread. Whereupon consultation was had out of hand among the learned, and sentence giuen, that euerie loafe was God almightie: and the bread was caried away with great solemnitie, reuerence, and such adoration as was due to the sonne of the euerlasting God. Now would I know, when the priest hath pronounced three of the saide words, *viz.* (*hoc est corpus*) what is become of the bread afore him. For if they answere, that it is Christs bodie; then will it follow to their shame, that one of the wordes of their consecration is of no force; which to die for it, the Papists may not admit. If they say, that a part of Christs bodie is then wrought really, by vertue of the sayd words, then will it follow to their greater shame, that Christs bodie

This is a great woonderment, and extreame popish follie.

die is really torne in pieces, by force of their bloodie and most cruell masse. If they say, that nought is indeede effected, vntill the last fillable of the last word be pronounced; then will it follow to their confusion, that of foure words wherein consisteth their whole consecration, three are of no vertue, force, or efficacie, but stand as cyphers to fill vp the place, and to make a shew of that which is not.

Fiftly, *Durandus* telleth vs, that onely the forme of bread is changed, and that the matter of bread remaineth still in the Eucharist. *Rupertus* the popish Abbot holdeth, that the bread is vnited hypostatically to the sonne of God. *Caietanus*, *Henricus*, and *Capreolus*, are of another opinion: *Iohannes Parisiensis* held also that the breade was assumpted, but in a different manner from the opinion of *Rupertus*. Another opinion, affirmeth the annihilation of the bread: but the Iesuit *Bellarmine* holdeth with their Counsell of Trent, that the bread is transubstantiated into the bodie of Christ.

Sixtly, the Papists tell vs, that when the Priest is at masse, then all spectators must adore that which hee holdeth ouer his head, and constantly beleeue it to bee their maker and redeemer of the world: and if any hold contrarie opinion, or teach the contrarie doctrine, that person must be burnt with fire and faggot for his paines. But yet for all this, the popish faith telleth vs, that if euer the Priest want intention to consecrate, (which often chaunceth, or at least may chaunce, by reason of wandring imaginations) or of purpose meaneth not to consecrate, or of negligence omitteth, or miscalleth any word of consecration; then by popish doctrine, faith, and religion, the thing adored for God almightie, is but pure Bakers bread; and consequently, the adorers thereof become idolaters, worshipping a piece of bread for the euerliuing God.

Seuenthly, the Papists tell vs, that many Priests are appointed at once to pronounce the words of consecration,

in

in the Romish Church Lateran when they are made priests. But they cannot tell vs, how many gods, or how many times God is made in one and the same piece or cake of bread, in and at that masse of the newly made priests. For they are all appointed to consecrate, they doe al pronounce the wordes, they are all bounden to haue intention, & they all haue the fit and requisite matter to worke vpon: but when the principall actor and chiefe agent, to wit, the Bishop, is at the last syllable; then some of the rest be in the middest, some toward the end, some in one place, some in an other, neuer one iumping with other in that instant, in which they should their bread-god make. For of this dreadfull mysterie, there are three solemne dissonant opinions. Pope *Innocentius* holdeth, that they all doe consecrate: *Durandus* auoucheth, that that priest onely consecrateth, which with greatest speed first commeth to the end: but Cardinall *Caietanus* hath a different consideration. Now would I know, how these so different popish opinions, in a matter of so great importance, can be reconciled and saued from contradiction. Answere papists if you can, or else relent and yeelde to the truth for shame.

Ioseph. Angl. in 4. S. pag. 180

The

The third Article. Of popish dispensations.

ANtonimus sometime Archbishop of Florence, comming as Ambassadour from the Pope, telleth vs, if we may beleeue him, that the Pope is Christs vicar vpon earth, and hath equall power with God Almightie. These are his owne expresse words; *Cum autem vicarius Christi sit Papa, nullus potest seipsum subtrahere ab obedientia eius de iure, sicut nullus de iure potest se subtrahere ab obediētia Dei. Et sicut recepit Christus à patre ducatū & sceptrum ecclesiæ gentium ex* Israel *egrediens, super omnem principatum & potestatem, & super omne quodcunq; est, vt ei genua cuncta curuentur; sic ipse* Petro *& successoribus eius, plenissimā potestatē commisit.* For seeing the Pope is the vicar of Christ none can lawfully withdraw himselfe from his obedience, as none can lawfully withdraw himselfe from Gods obedience. And as Christ receiued of his father the dukedome & scepter of the Church of the Gentiles arising of *Israel*, ouer all principalitie and power, and aboue euery thing that hath being, that to him euery knee may bend: euen so Christ hath cōmitted most full power to *Peter* and his successors.

Antoninus, 3. par. tit. 22. cap. 5. §. 8.

The famous popish frier, *Augustinus de Ancona*, in that booke which he dedicated to Pope *Iohn* the twelft of that name, singeth the same song, and affirmeth the Pope to haue the same power. These are his expresse words; *(Papa) tanquam vicarius Dei filij cælestis imperatoris, iurisdictionem habet vniuersalem super omnia regna & imperia.* The Pope, as he that is the vicar of the sonne of God the heauenly Emperour,

Aug. de Anch. in summa, pag. 152.

perour, hath vniuersall iurisdiction ouer all kingdoms and empyres. Many other Papists haue the like testimonies, but they are needlesse, seeing the Pope is a sufficient witnesse against himselfe, hauing often reduced their assertions to actuall execution. For the Pope hath often by his wicked and execrable dispensations, taken vpon him to dissolue that matrimony which is firme and stable by Christs owne institution. The former part is prooued by their learned canonist *Martinus Nauarrus*, in these expresse words: *Diuiditur (matrimonium) ante consummationem, per dispensationem Papæ iusta de causa factam.* Matrimony is dissolued before consummation, by the Popes dispensation vpon iust cause graunted. Now to prooue that the Pope may doe this, *Nauarre* taketh it for a good ground, that the Pope hath practised the same. Thus doth he write: *Quorum opinio adeo obseruatur, quod etiam ter vel quater ad petitiones consilio meo antequam in vrbem venissem oblatas, Paulus 3. & Pius 4. per suas dispensationes, dissoluerunt quædam matrimonia omnino clandestina nondum consummata, in remedium animarum alioquin probabiliter perituraarum.* Whose opinion (hee speaketh of the Canonists) is so obserued, that three or foure times before my comming to Rome, vpon petitions made by mine aduise, Pope *Paulus* the third, and Pope *Pius* the fourth, with their dispensations dissolued certaine secret matrimonies not yet cõsummate, for the safegard of soules, which by likelihood would otherwise haue perished.

Nauar. in Enchar. cap. 22. par. 21.

Nauar. vbi sup.

And another famous popish Canonist *Couarruvias* affirmeth, that Pope *Paulus* the fourth and *Iulius* the third dispensed in like manner. These are his words: *Nec me latet Paulum quartum summum ecclesiæ pontificem, anno 1558. hac vsum fuisse dispensatione quibusdam ex causis, quas iustissimas esse idem summus ecclesiæ præsul existimauit. Idem Paulo ante Iulius tertius fecerat in eodem matrimonio, cum ecclesiæ vniuersali præsiderit.* Neyther am I ignorant, that Pope *Paul* the fourth put this dispensation in practise, for certaine causes which the same Pope thought to be most iust. *Iulius* the third, when he was Pope, in like case graunted the like dis-

Couar. to. 1. cap. 7. par. 4. n. 13. col. 1.

penſation. Thus we ſee the former part of mine aſſertion to be moſt ſufficiently prooued, *viz.* that the Pope taketh vpon him to diſſolue lawfull and perfect matrimony. Now for proofe of the latter, *viz.* that wedlocke before conſummation or copulation, is firme and perfect, and cannot bee diſſolued by the power of man: Chriſts owne words are a ſufficient ground. *Quod deus coniunxit, homo non ſeparet.* That which God hath conioyned, let no man put aſunder. And in another place Chriſt hath theſe words: *Omnis qui dimittit vxorem ſuam, & alteram ducit, mœchatur.* Euery one that putteth away his wife, and marryeth another, committeth adulterie.

Matth. 19. *v.* 7.

Luke. 16. *v.* 18.

1. *Cor.* 7. *v.* 10. S. *Paul* vpon the ſame argument deliuereth the like doctrine in theſe words: *His autem qui matrimonio iuncti ſunt precipio non ego, ſed dominus, vxorem à viro non diſcedere; quod ſi diſceſſerit, manere inuptam, aut ſuo viro reconciliari, & vir vxorem non dimittat.* Thoſe that are marryed commaund not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband: but if ſhe ſhall depart, then to abide vnmarried, or to be reconciled to her husband.

Thus ſaith S. *Paul*, and thus ſaith Chriſt himſelfe, that man and wife ioyned by Chriſt, muſt abide during life together; or liue vnmarryed, and not to be ſeuered by the Popes diſpenſation.

And it will not help the Pope to ſay as the Ieſuit *Bellarmine* doth, and others with him, That Chriſt onely ſpeaketh *de matrimonio conſummato*, and that *matrimonium ratum*, with which the Pope diſpenſeth, is not *de iure diuino*.

For firſt, if *matrimonium ratum* were not *de iure diuino*, the greateſt Popiſh Doctors would not denie the Popes diſpenſation therein.

Secondly, Chriſt ſpeaketh abſolutely, and maketh no mention of copulation, or popiſh conſummation at all.

Thirdly, matrimony with Papiſts is a diuine ſacrament, and conſequently it both is perfect without carnall copulation, and alſo indiſpenſable by the power of man. For as their own famous doctor *Melchior Canus* ſaith, *Sanctus ſpiritus*

Canus de locis lib. 8. *ca.* 5. *p.* 246.

ritus & sacramenti gratia, per coitum non datur. The holy ghost & the grace of sacrament is not giuen by copulation.

Fourthly, it followeth hereupon, that matrimony is not fully perfect in the popish Church, because copulation followeth a good while after.

Fiftly, because it is absurd to say, that it beginneth to be a sacrament by carnal copulation, and was not a sacrament by the priests action.

Sixtly, it followeth hereupon, that there was not perfect matrimony betweene *Adam* and *Eue*, for their matrimony was in the state of innocencie, and before all carnall copulation.

Seuenthly, because if matrimony bee not *de iure diuino*, euen before copulation, there is no cause why both parties agreeing together, may not release the bargaine, and quite dissolue the contract. For as the law saith, *Quisque potest suo iuri cedere.* Euerie man may yeeld vp his right: which thing, all, as well Canonists as Diuines, admit for good in *sponsalibus.*

Eightly, it followeth hereuppon, that the marriage betweene the blessed Virgine and S. *Ioseph*, was not perfect matrimonie: for there doubtlesse wanted carnall copulation; but the Angell of God feared not to call her *Iosephs* wife. *Matth.1.*

S. *Ambrose* hath these words: *Non enim defloratio virginitatis facit coniugium, sed pactio coniugalis.* For not the defloruring of virginitie maketh wedlocke, but the coniugall couenant. *Ambro. de inst. virg. ca. 6.*

S. *Austens* iudgement herein is most cleere and euident. These are his words. *Cum igitur ipse narret, non ex concubitu Ioseph, sed ex Maria virgine natum Christum, vnde eum patrem eius appellat, nisi quia & virum Mari rectè intelligimus sine commixtione carnis, ipsa copulatione coniugij.* When therfore he telleth vs, that Christ is not borne of *Iosephs* copulation, but of the Virgine *Marie*; vpon what ground doth he call him his father, but only for that we doe rightly conceiue him to be *Maries* husband without the cõmixion of *August. de cõsens. euang. lib. 2. cap. 1. to. 4.*

flesh, by the verie copulation of wedlocke.

Augustin. de nupt. js & cõcupisc. lib. 1. cap. 11. tom. 7.

The same Father writing to *Valerius*, discourseth of this matter at large, and among many other notable sentences setteth downe these words: *Quibus vero placuit, ex consensu ab vsu carnalis concupiscentiæ in perpetuum continere, absit vt inter illos vinculum coniugale rumpatur. Sequiter neque enim fallaciter ab angelo dictum est ad Ioseph, noli timere, accipere Mariam coniugem tuam.* They that were content by mutuall consent to abstaine for euer from the vse of carnall copulation, God forbid, that between them should be dissolued the bond of wedlocke. For the Angell did not speak deceitfully to *Ioseph*, when he willed him not to feare to take *Marie* his wife vnto him.

Thus wee see it cleere, that the Pope taketh vppon him that power and authoritye which is proper to God alone: for hee practically auoucheth (as I haue prooued by his owne deere Doctors) that his dispensations are of force to vnmarry and put a sunder those persons whome God himselfe hath ioyned together in holy wedlocke. And contrariwise (as I shall prooue vnto you) hee practically hath taken vppon him to ioyne in wedlocke those persons, to whom God himselfe hath forbidden marriage. I will omit knowne examples, and alledge one onely not knowne to many; which as it is rare and notorious, so is it able to prouoke all that heare it, to exclaime against the execrable practise of the Pope.

Antoni. 3. p. tit. 1. cap. 1. prope fin.

Antonius, a man of no small credit (for he was an Archbishop of the popish stampe, and by the Pope reported for a Saint, hath these very wordes: *Reperitur tamen papa Martinus quintus dispensasse cum quodam, qui contraxerat & consummauerat matrimonium cum quadam eius germana.* Neuertheless, it is knowne, that Pope *Martin* the fift did dispense with one who had contracted and consummated matrimony with his owne naturall and full sister, of the same father and same mother, for so much the word (*Germana*) doth import. Behold here, gentle reader, the excellency of holy Poperie: and if thou desirest more of such melo-

Fatetur Durandus olim papam dispensando errasse. lib. 4. sent. dist. 7. q. 4. in fine.

die

die, thou mayest find it in my Booke of Motiues. But this here is a sufficient antepast for all our English Iesuites and Iesuited popelings. None are so ignorant, but they know that onely God can giue licence to marrie a mans owne naturall sister. Answere Papists if ye can, or else yeeld vnto the truth for shame.

The fourth Article. Of originall concupiscence in the regenerat.

Saint *Paul* throughout the whole seuenth Chapter to the Romans, *Rom. 7.* prooueth originall concupiscence in the regenerate, to be sinne. But the Papists cannot abide to heare this doctrine, they stop their eares *Psal. 58. v. 6.* against the charmer, though hee charme neuer so wisely. And why I pray you? becausе forsooth it ouerthroweth thir holy so supposed iustifications, their inherēt purities, their mutual satisfactions, their condigne merits, their pharisaicall supererogations. And yet *Petrus Lombardus* their famous Master of sentences (whose Booke to this day is publickely read in their Schooles of Diuinitie) vtterly condemneth their damnable doctrine in this point. These are his expresse words: *Lombard. li. 3. sent. dist. 19.* *Secundum animas vero iam redempti sumus ex parte, non ex toto; à culpa, non à pœna, nec omnino à culpa, non enim ab ea sic redempti sumus, vt non sit, sed vt non dominetur.* But touching our soules, we are redeemed in part, not wholly, from the sinne, not from the paine, neither wholly from the sinne

Now must the papists perforce either recant their doctrin, or els crie fire and faggot for their chiefe master.

or default. For we are not so redeemed from it, that it bee not (in vs) but that it rule not (ouer vs.) Thus writeth the worshipfull popish Master, our reuerend father *Lombard*: out of whose words we may gather with facilitie so much as will serue our turne against the Papists. For first he saith, we are redeemed in part, but not in the whole. Secondly, that we are not wholly redeemed from sinne. Thirdly, he telleth vs how we are redeemed from sinne, *viz.* that albeit sinne still remaine in vs, yet hath it not such dominion ouer vs, that it can enforce vs to consent thereunto. Loe this doctrine is not mine, but the flat doctrine of the Papists, which I learned of that great Papist, who for his learning was surnamed the Master of sentences, and to this day is publickly read in their Diuinitie schooles.

Touching S. *Paule*, he sayth first in this manner: I my
Rom.7.v.25. selfe with the minde serue the law of God, but with the flesh, the lawe of sinne. Out of these words I note first, that the Apostle speaketh of the regenerate throughout this whole Chapter, because he nameth himselfe, who was Gods chosen and elect vessell. For which respect, and the like expressed in the seuenth Chapter to the Romanes,
Aug.li.1.retract.cap.22. p.23. S. *Austen* changed his opinion, and graunted S. *Paule* to speake heere of the regenerate. I note secondly, that the elect and regenerate doe serue the lawe of sinne. I note thirdly, that the best liuers are so farre from meriting *ex condigno*, grace and glorie, that they deserue in rigour of iustice, eternall death, because death is the reward of sinne. Which for that S. *Austen* could not well digest at the first, he thought that S. *Paules* wordes were to be vnderstoode of the reprobate, and not of the elect and godly sort: but when he had pondered the Apostles discourse and words more seriously, hee changed his opinion. This is confirmed in the selfe same Chapter in these words: But
Rom.7.v,23. I see another lawe in my members, rebelling against the law of my minde, and subduing me vnto the law of sinne, which is in my members. By these words it is euident, that albeit S. *Paule* were the Child of God, yet could hee not

not merite any thing in Gods sight: but rather in rigour of iustice prouoke Gods heauie displeasure against him: For where or what could be his merite, who was prisoner to the law of sinne? Againe, the same is confirmed in these words: For I do not the good which I would, but the euill which I would not, that doe I. Thus saith S. *Paule*. And doubtlesse, since he did the euill which he would not, he sinned, though he were regenerate: and in that he sinned, he was guiltie of damnation, because death is the stipend of sinne. For this cause grauely saith S. *Austen*: *Cum deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat, quam munera sua.* When God crowneth our merites, he crowneth nothing else, but his owne gifts. Againe, the same is confirmed in these words, For the law is spirituall, but I am carnall, sold vnder sinne. Thus saith S. *Paule* of himselfe. And yet it is most true, that one vnder the burthen of sinne can merite nothing saue hell fire and eternall paine. Againe, the same is confirmed in these words: If I doe that I would not, then it is not I that doth it, but sinne that dwelleth in me. Loe S. *Paule* graunteth that to be sinne in himselfe, which yet himselfe consenteth not vnto. And that he speaketh of originall concupiscence, which remaineth in the regenerate after baptisme, it cannot be denied. And it will not serue the turne, to say as *Bellarmine* doth, *viz.* that originall concupiscence remaineth after baptisme, but is no sinne at all: and that it is called sinne onely in this respect, because it prouoketh a man to sinne; as a mans writing is called his hand, because it is written with his hand. For first, their owne master *Petrus Lombardus* graunteth it to be sinne, euen as S. *Paule* doth. Secondly, it causeth man to serue the law of sinne, which seruice can neuer bee but sinne. Thirdly, S. *Paule* saith, he doth that ill which hee would not, and that which he doth hate. All which must needs be meant of sinne.

Rom.7.v.19.

August.epist. 105.pag.301.

Rom.7.v.14.

Rom.7.v.20.

That concupiscence remaining after baptisme, is truly called sinne, the papists themselues confesse vnawares in a maine point of doctrine and setled ground of their religion.

gion. Marke well gentle reader what I shall deliuer in this behalfe.

God chose all in Christ that shall bee saued before the foundation of the world: and likewise reprobated all both negatiuely and positiuely (that I may vse their schoole-tearmes:) but positiuely, for the foresight of originall sinne. For the proofe hereof, it will suffice to alledge the words of our papists at Rhemes, in their notes vpon the new Testament. Thus do they write: So likewise, God seeing all mankind, and euery one of the same, in a generall condemnation and masse of sinne in and by *Adam*, deliuereth some and not othersome. These are their own words: and that which they teach, is the common doctrine of the Romish Church. Againe, the same Rhemists in the chapter afore quoted, haue these words: by the same example of those twins, it is euident also, that neither nations nor particular persons be elected eternally, or called temporally, or preferred to Gods fauour before others by their owne merits: because God when he made choise and first loued *Iacob*, and refused *Esau*, respected them both as ill, and the one no lesse than the other guiltie of damnation for originall sinne, which was alike in them both. And therefore where iustly he might haue reprobated both, he saued of mercie one. This is that strong foundation where on the papists thinke predestination to be built: the which I willingly doe admit, as which will make good my position euen against themselues. For seeing as they grant; That God beholding all in a generall condemnation for originall sinne, saueth the elect of mercie, and iustly decreeth to condemne the reprobate for originall sinne: it followeth of necessity, that either some reprobate shall be saued, which the papists neither dare nor may auouch, or else that concupiscence remaining after baptisme, is sinne indeed, which is the doctrine I defend. The consequution and illation is euident. For if originall sinne bee truly remitted in baptisme, and be not truly sinne in the baptised, then can none be iustly damned that are baptised: for how shall

Rhemes test. in Rom. 9. v. 14.

Rhem. Rom. 9 v. 11.

Marke well this dilemma.

Iuno per actualia & propria sua peccata quid ni:

shall they be iustly condemned, for that which is remitted? it cannot bee. And to graunt that all baptised persons shall be saued, is most absurd; neyther can I thinke any Papist so senseleſſe, as to affirme the same. For to name one for all: their Pope *Boniface* the eight, who (as their owne deere Fryer *Caranza* saith) entred into the Popedome as a foxe, raigned in it as a wolfe, and dyed in the end as a dog: is not I trow a Saint in heauen; and yet must we thinke hee was baptised, or els a terrible *væ vobis* will fall vpon our papists. *Caranza. in summa conciliorum, fol. 369.*

Now because the papists vse to boast, that S. *Austen* is on their side, I will prooue at large, that he defendeth this my doctrine here deliuered: and that I purpose in God to doe so plainely and euidently, as none can stand in doubt thereof, that shall seriously ponder my discourse.

The first place of S. Austen.

Sicut cæcitas cordis, quam solus remouet illuminator Deus, & peccatum est quo in deum non creditur; & pœna peccati, qua cor superbum digna animaduersione punitur: & causa peccati, cum mali aliquid cæci cordis errore committitur; ita concupiscentia carnis, aduersus quã bonus concupiscit spiritus, & peccatum est, quia inest illi inobedientia contra dominatũ mentis: & pœna peccati est, quia reddita est meritis inobedientis; & causa peccati est, defectione consentientis vel contagione nascentis. Like as the blindnesse of heart, which onely God the illuminatour doth remoue, is sinne, through which man beleeueth not in God; and the punishment of sinne, wherewith a proud heart is iustly chastened; and the cause of sinne, when through the blindenesse of heart any euill is committed; euen so concupiscence of the flesh, against which the good spirit coueteth, is sinne, because there is in it disobedience against the gouernment of the minde: and also a punishment of sinne, because it was rendred to the merits of the disobedient: and it is also the cause of sinne, by defection of him that consenteth, or by contagion of the childe that is borne. *Aug. lib. 5. cont. Iulian. cap. 3. tom. 7.*

In theſe wordes, Saint *Auſten* expreſſeth three things preciſely; firſt, that concupiſcence in the regenerate, is the puniſhment of ſinne; ſecondly, that it is the cauſe of ſinne; thirdly, that it is ſinne it ſelfe. Which three, Saint *Anſten* doth not onely diſtinguiſh, but withall he yeeldeth three ſeuerall reaſons for the ſame: and that he ſpeaketh of the regenerate, it is euident in this; becauſe hee ſpeaketh of that concupiſcence, againſt which the good ſpirit ſtriueth. Moſt impudent therefore are the Papiſtr, when they auouch with open mouth, that Saint *Auſten* onely calleth it ſinne, becauſe it is the cauſe of ſinne. And the gentle Reader may here alſo obſerue, that Saint *Auſten* compareth concupiſcence of the fleſh, with that blindneſſe of heart which breedeth infidelitie in man: which how great a ſinne it is, euery one can tell.

The ſecond place of Saint Auſten

Aug. contr. Iulian. lib. 6. cap. 8. tom. 7.

NEque enim nulla eſt iniquitas, cum in vno homine vel ſuperiora inferioribus turpiter ſeruiunt; vel inferiora ſuperioribus contumaciter reluctantur, etiam ſi vincere non ſinantur. For it is ſome iniquitie, when in one man eyther the ſuperiour parts ſhamefully ſerue the inferiour; or the inferiour parts ſtubbornely ſtriue againſt the ſuperiour, although they be not ſuffered to preuaile.

Theſe words of Saint *Auſten* are ſo plaine, as the papiſts cannot poſſibly invent any euaſion at all. For he ſaith in plaine and expreſſe termes; that the rebellion which is betweene the fleſh and the ſpirit is ſinne: yea, that it is euen then ſinne, when it is reſiſted and cannot preuaile. At which time, and in which reſpect, the Papiſts will haue it to be merite, but no ſinne at all. Behold a flat contradiction, it is ſinne, ſaith Saint *Auſten:* it is merite and no ſinne, ſay the Papiſts.

The third place of Saint Auſten.

Auguſt. de nuptiis & concupiſ. lib. 1 cap. 25. to. 7.

SI in parente baptizato poteſt & eſſe & peccatum non eſſe, cur eadem ipſa in prole peccatum eſt? ad hæc reſpondetur, dimitti

mitti concupiscentiam carnis in baptismo, non vt non sit, sed vt in peccatum non imputetur. Sequitur, non ergo aliquid remanet quod non remittatur, cum sit sicut scriptū est, propitius dominus omnibus iniquitatibus nostris; sed donec fiat & quod sequitur, qui sanat omnes languores tuos, qui redimet de corruptione vitā tuam: manet in corpore mortis huius carnalis concupiscentia. If concupiscence can both be in the baptised parent, & withall be no sin, why is the selfesame made sinne in the child? to this, this is the answere; that the concupiscence of the flesh is forgiuen in baptisme, not so that it remaine not, but so that it is not reputed for sin. Not any thing therefore remaineth, which is not forgiuen, seeing that is done which is written, God is mercifull to all our iniquities: but vntill that be done also which followeth, which healeth all thine infirmities; which redeemeth thy life from corruption; carnall concupiscence abideth in the body of this death. *Psal.* 103. *v.* 3.

It remaineth, sinne by nature, and so passeth by regeneration, from the parents to tha children.

Saint *Austen* in these words sheweth plainely, that concupiscence remaineth as well in the baptised parent, as in the vnbaptised child; yet with this difference, that it is sin in the parent, though not for sin imputed; but in the Child it both is sinne, and is also so reputed. And the Reader must not forget, that Saint *Austen* saith, Nothing remaineth which is not forgotten. He doth not say, Nothing is sin that remaineth: or thus, No sin remaineth: but thus, Not any thing remayneth, which is not remitted. As if he had sayd, sin indeed remayneth still in the baptised, but shall not bee imputed to the faithfull. Marke well, gentle Reader, the phrase which Saint *Austen* heere vseth. It is forgiuen that still remayneth, saith Saint *Austen*: or, not any thing remaineth, which is not forgiuen. Therfore he must needs meane, that something remayneth which is sin, though pardoned and not reputed sinne. For nothing hath neede of forgiuenesse, but that which is sinne indeed.

The fourth place of Saint Austen.

Ideo apostolus non ait facere bonū sibi non adiacere, sed perficere, multū enim boni facit, qui facit quod scriptū est: post cōcupiscentias *Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 29.*

Piscentias tuas non eas; sed non perficit, quia non implet quod scriptum; non concupisces. The Apostle therefore saith not, that hee hath not power to doe good, but that hee cannot perfect that which is good. For hee doth great good, who doth that which is written; Follow not thy lusts: but hee doth not perfect his wel-doing, because he doth not fulfill that which is written, Thou shalt not lust.

Out of these wordes of Saint *Austen*, I note many memorable documents. First, that Saint *Austen* speaketh these woords of the regenerate; for they onely can doe this good, whereof the Apostle speaketh. Secondly, that though the regenerate can doe good, and striue against lust; yet can they not doe that good so perfectly, but it is alwayes annexed to sinne, and chayned with it, as with an heauie yokefellow. Thirdly, that the tenth commaundement (marke well my wordes) prohibiteth not onely actuall lust done with consent, but also originall lust committed without consent; and consequently, that concupiscence remayning in the regenerate, is sinne properly and formally. I prooue it, because Saint *Paul* could not performe this precept, as Saint *Austen* truely and learnedly obserued: who for all that touching actuall sinne, was most free and innocent. For he fought mightily against his raging concupiscence, and did in no wise yeeld thereunto. Hee was therefore guilty by reason of originall concupiscence, which abode in him against his will.

Rom.7.v.7. Therefore most absurd is the exposition of the Rhemists, who beare the Reader in hand, that Saint *Paul* speaketh not of the habituall concupiscence, or sensuall desire and inclination to euill, when hee forbiddeth to lust. For if onely the consent of our reason and minde, to obey and to follow the lusts thereof, were sinne indeed; then should Saint *Austens* exposition bee very childish and too too absurd, who telleth vs plainely in expresse tearmes, That *S. Paul* could not fulfill that precept, although hee did not yeeld his consent vnto it, neither did obey or followe the desires thereof. No, no, Saint *Paul* had no such meaning;

he

hee named it sinne, as it is indeed. He saith, hee had not knowne lust to be sinne, except the law had sayde, Thou shalt not lust. But hee could neuer be ignorant, that concupiscence with consent was sinne; seeing the verie heathen men did knowe, and confesse the same. Againe, that actuall concupiscence which our Rhemists speake of, is forbidden in the sixt, seuenth, and eight Commaundements; as Christ himselfe expounded them. And consequently, the tenth commaundement forbiddeth, the very habituall and sensuall desire, or inclination to sinne, and the euill fruits thereof; that is, wicked, vicious, and iniurious thoughts, though we resist and striue against them. This is the expresse doctrine of Saint *Austen* in another place, which he deliuereth in these words; *Agit enim aliquid concupiscentia carnis, & quando non exhibetur ei vel cordis assensus, vbi regnet, vel membra velut arma, quibus impleatur quod iubet: agit autem quid, nisi ipsa desideria mala & turpia? Non enim si bona & licita essent, eis obedire prohiberet apostolus.* For concupiscence of the flesh worketh something euen when there is not giuen vnto it, either the consent of the heart, where it may reigne; or the members as weapons, wich may accomplish what it appointeth. And what doth it, but the verie wicked and filthy desires? For if they were good and lawfull, the Apostle would not forbid to obey them.

Rom.7.v.7.

Matt.5.v.22.

Aug. de nupt. & concup. lib. 1. cap. 27.

Rom.6.v.12.

Marke these wordes, gentle Reader; for they fortifie that which is alreadie said, and giue a deadly blow to the Papists: two things are cleered by this testimonie of Saint *Austen*, the one, that concupiscence to which consent is not giuen, bringeth forth ill desires: the other, that the saide desires are vnlawfull, and prohibited by the law of God. And so wee haue it euidently prooued, by many inuinsible reasons; that concupiscence habitued, to which the regenerate yeelde no consent, but stoutly resist the same; is so farre from being meritorious, as the papists teach, that it is sinne formally, and properly so called. Neither will it serue their turne, to obiect that which is

euer in their mouthes, that it is inuoluntarie, and can no way be auoided, and so no sinne at all. This obiection I grant, carrieth a maiestie with it; and it seemeth to many men, to be insoluble. But God willing, I shall make it so cleere and euident, as euery child may behold with facilitie, the weakenesse, falshood, and absurdity thereof.

Aug. lib. 1. retract. cap. 13. pag. 13.

Saint *Austen* proueth at large in sundrie places of his workes, that inuoluntary motions of concupiscence are sinne indeede, and truely so called. In his first Booke of retractions, he hath these words; *Illud quod in paruulis dicitur originale peccatum, cum adhuc non vtantur libero arbitrio voluntatis, non absurdè vocatur etiam voluntarium; quia ex primi hominis mala voluntate contractum, factum est quodammodo hereditarium. Non ita q̃ falsum est quod dixi, vsq; adeò peccatum voluntarium malum est, vt nullo modo sit peccatum si non sit voluntarium.* That which in infants is called originall sinne, which as yet they vse not free arbitrement of will, is not absurdly called voluntarie; because being contracted of the euill will of the first man, it is become in a sort hereditarie. It is not therefore false which I said, sinne is an euill so voluntarie, that it is no way sin, if it be not voluntary.

Aug. retract. lib. 1. cap. 15. pag. 16.

Again in another place S. *Austen* hath these words; *Quod si quisquã dicit etiam ipsam cupiditatẽ nihil esse aliud quam voluntatẽ sed vitiosam peccatoq; seruientẽ, non resistendum est, nec de verbis, cum res constat, controuersia facienda est. Sic enim ostenditer sine voluntate nullum esse peccatum, siue in opere, siue in origine.* But if any man say, that concupiscence is nothing else, than a will that is vitious & seruing sin, there is no resistance to be made; neither must controuersie be in words, whẽ the thing is cleer & euident. For so we proue euery sin to be voluntarie, either in the act, or else in the originall.

Augustin. vbi sup. pag. 17.

Again, he hath these words; *Propterea non perturbat de paruulis quæstio, quia ex illius origine rei tenetur qui voluntate peccauit, quãdo libero & ad faciendum, & ad non faciendum motu animi non carebat, eiq; ab opere malo abstinẽdi sũma potestas erat.* Therfore let no man be trobled wirh the questiõ about infants, because they are guiltie by reason of his originall, that

that sinned voluntarily; hauing free motion of minde both to do and not to do, as also full power to absteine frō euill.

Thus we see most euidently, that the vnuoluntary motions of concupiscence, so tearmed of the papists, are both sinfull and voluntarie: sinfull in their nature, and voluntarie in the originall. And the Papists may as well denie concupiscence to be sinne in the infants vnbaptised, as in them that are baptised, vpon this their falsly supposed ground. For it is as vnuoluntarie in the one, as it is in the other; neither can it be any more auoided in the one, than in the other. This is the gordian knot which the Papists are neuer able to loose, or vntie.

Bellarmine himselfe is enforced to confesse, that Saint *Austen* acknowledgeth all the motions of concupiscence, euen those wich bee inuoluntarie, to be properly sinne, and flatly condemned by the tenth commaundement. These are his expresse words; *Hæc dicta sunt ad mentem* S. Augustini, *qui precepto, non concupisces, intelligit prohiberi aliquo modo motus omnes concupiscentiæ, etiam inuoluntarios; assensum vero his motibus, prohibere docet illo alio precepto: post concupiscentias tuas non eas.* These things are spoken after S. *Austens* mind, who by this precept, (Thou shalt not lust) vnderstandeth all the motions of concupiscence, euen the inuoluntarie, to be prohibited in some sort; and that the consent to these motions, is forbidden by that other precept; Follow not thy concupiscence. Thus writeth the Iesuiticall Cardinall: by whose doctrine it is euident, that Saint *Austen* affirmeth the first motions of concupiscence: which present reason cannot bee auoyded to bee condemned by Saint *Paul*, as sinfull and against the lawe of God. Which doctrine of Saint *Austen* doth so sting and confound all papists, that *Bellarmine* knoweth not in the world what hee shall aunswere to the same. And therefore deceitfully he addeth in his exposition of Saint *Austens* words, the word (*quodammodo*, after a sort;) which word neither is in Saint *Austen*, nor yet agreeable to his meaning. For Saint *Austen* saith plainely, simply, and absolutely,

Bellarm. to 3. col. 403. vide Aug. de spiritu & liter. cap. vlt. to 3.

Eccles. 18. v. 30.

lutely, without all ands, or ifs, or other qualifications, that such motions are forbidden by this commandement, (*non concupiſces.*) And for the conſummation of this doctrine, (which ouerthroweth the beſt part of poperie,) I will here adde to Saint *Pauls* doctrine, and the expoſition of Saint *Auſten*; the flat teſtimonie of Saint *Iohn* an other Apoſtle, who ſingeth the ſame ſong with Saint *Paul*.

1. Ioan. 3. v. 4. Saint *Iohn* in his firſt Epiſtle, hath theſe words; πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ. καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Euery one that ſinneth, tranſgreſſeth the law. And ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law. Theſe are S. *Iohns* words truly tranſlated out of the originall Greeke. But be-

Rhemes teſt. in the notes in 1. Ioan. 3. 4. fore we proceede any further in the diſcourſe hereof, let vs take a view of that doctrine, which our papiſts of Rhemes haue ſent vs. Theſe are their words; Iniquitie is not taken here for wickedneſſe, as it is commonly vſed both in Latin & in our language, as is plaine by the Greeke word ἀνομία, ſignifying nothing elſe, but ſwaruing or declining from the ſtraight line of the law of God, or nature. So that the Apoſtle meaneth, that euery ſinne is an obliquitie or defect from the rule of the law: but not contrarie, that euery ſuch ſwaruing from the law, ſhould be properly a ſinne, as the heretikes doe vntruly gather, to proue that concupiſcence remaining after baptiſme is a very ſinne, though we neuer giue our conſent vnto it. Thus they write. Out of whoſe words, I gather two notable documents; the one, that the word ἀνομία is a defect and ſwaruing from the lawe, but not properly a ſinne: the other, that if ἀνομία be proued to be ſinne properly, then will it alſo follow of neceſſity by S. *Iohns* doctrine, that concupiſcence in the regenerate is properly ſinne. Let this doctrine be well marked, as which is no leſſe apparant then important. Now, it only remaineth for the victorie, and truth of this article, That I proue againſt our papiſts the Rhemiſts, that the Greeke word ἀνομία doth ſignifie ſinne properly: behold the proofe.

Arias Mont. in 1. Ioan. 3. A very famous Papiſt and great linguiſt, *Ben. Arias Montanus*, ſaith plainely in expreſſe tearmes, that ἀνομία

is

is *transgressio legis*, the transgression of the law. Now, that the transgression of Gods law is properly sinne, none is so sottish, that hee doth not vnderstand it; none is so impious, that hee will denie it; none so peuish, that hee will not acknowledge it. But I proue the same.

S. *Ambrose* hath these words: *Quid est enim peccatum, nisi preuaricatio legis diuinæ, & cœlestium inobedientia preceptorum?* For what is sinne, but the transgression of Gods law, and disobedience to his heauenly precepts? Loe, sinne (saith S. *Ambrose*) is nothing els but the transgression of Gods law, that is to say, nothing els but ἀνομία, as S. *Iohn* tearmeth it, and as *Arias Montanus* doth interpret it.

Ambros. de parad. ca. 8. to. 4. Vide de Ambros. in 7. ca. ad rom & in fine huius articuli.

S. *Austen* hath these words: *Peccatum est transgressio legis.* Sinne is a transgression of the law. Loe S. *Austen* concludeth with S. *Ambrose*, and they both agree with S. *Iohn*.

August. de consens. Euangel. cap. 4. tom. 4.

The same S. *Austen* in another place defineth sinne in this manner. *Peccatum est dictum, vel factum, vel concupitum aliquid, contra legem æternam.* Sin is a word, deed, thought, or desie against the eternall law (of God.) And what the eternall law is, he sheweth in these words next following in the same place: *Lex æterna est ratio diuina vel voluntas Dei, ordinem naturalem conseruari iubens, perturbari vetans.* The eternall law is the reason or will of God, which commaundeth the naturall order to be obserued, and forbiddeth the same to be perturbed.

Aug. con. Fau. lib. 22. ca. 27. to. 6. pa. 281.

Vide Bernard. de aduent. do. serm. 6. to. 1. pa. 16.

Thus writeth this auntient, graue, and learned father; by whose iudgement it is properly sinne, whatsoeuer is against the will of God. So then, Gods will is that law and rule, by which euery sinne must bee measured and tryed. And consequently, whatsoeuer deflecteth, declineth, or swarueth from the will of God, the same is most properly sinne. The reason hereof is euident, because not to be correspondent and agreeable to Gods will, is the very intrinsecall reason, essence, and nature of sinne. But so it is, that the ἀταξία, disorder, and concupiscence in the regenerate, is repugnant and disagreeable to the will of God: and consequently, it must be sinne indeed.

Beda in 1. Ioan. 3.

S. *Bede*, who for his learning and vertue was renowned throughout the whole Christian world, and therupon surnamed *Venerabilis*, hath these expresse words: *Virtus huius sententiæ facilius in lingua Græcorum, qua edita est epistola, comprehenditur. Si quidem apud eos iniquitas ἀνομία vocatur, quod significat quasi contra legem vel sine lege factum. Si quidem lex Græce νόμος appellatur sequitur; sed & latinum nomen eidem rationi congruit, quod iniquitas quasi æquitati aduersa nuncupatur. Quia quicunque peccat, contrarius nimirum equitati diuinæ legis peccando existit.* The force and efficacie of this sentence is more easily perceiued in the Greeke tongue, in which the epistle was written. For iniquitie with them is called ἀνομία, which signifieth, As done against law, or without law. For the law is called in Greeke νόμος. The Latine word also agreeth to the same reason, because it is called iniquitie, as being against equitie: for euery one that sinneth is by reason of sinne, cõtrary to the equitie of Gods law. See more to this effect in the eight article following.

Dionys. Carthus. in 1. Ioan. 3.

Dionysius Carthusianus, a famous papist, hath these words: *Lex autem diuina est æquitas ipsa; sicq; mortale peccatum est iniquitas, id est, non æquitas, vtpote violatio æquitatis*. The Law of God is equitie it selfe: and consequently, iniquitie, that is, not equitie, to wit, the transgression of equitie, is a mortall sinne.

Lyr. in 1. Ioan. 3.

Nicolaus de Lyra, another famous popish writer, hath these words: *Peccatum est transgressio legis diuinæ. Lex autem diuina est ipsa æquitas; & ideo in omni peccato mortali est æquitatis corruptio, & per consequens, iniquitas.* Sinne is the transgression of the Law diuine; and therefore in euery mortall sinne there is corruption of equitie: and consequently, there is also iniquitie.

The Corollarie.

Now gentle reader, thou hast heard the expresse words and plaine testimonies, as well of the auncient Fathers, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Austen*, and S. *Bede*, as also of the two famous popish writers, *Carthusianus* and *Lyranus*, concerning this great question & most important point of doctrine, in which

which the very life of poperie doth consist.

I haue prooued first euen by the testimony of S. *Páule*, and of S. *Austen*, expounding his words, as also of the Iesuit *Bellarmine* graunting the same; that concupiscence remaining after baptisme in the regenerate, is both called sin, and is properly sinne indeed.

Secondly, that the first motions of concupiscence which are connaturall to the corrupt man, and can no way bee auoided, are flatly forbidden by this Commandement, *Thou shalt not couet.*

Thirdly, that though the sayd rebellious motions bee inuoluntarie in the worke; yet are they voluntary in the originall: which is sufficient saith S. *Austen.*

Fourthly, that cardinall *Bellarmine* not able truely to answere S. *Austens* words, hath in his explication added deceitfully, this word (*quodammodo*) after a sort: Which word cannot be found in S. *Austen*, neither is it agreeable to his meaning. But such beggerly shifts and silly euasions are the props and stayes of late Romish religion.

Fiftly, that by S. *Iohns* doctrine, euery deflection from the eternall law, is properly ἀνομία, and consequently, it is properly sinne.

Sixtly, that S. *Ambrose*. S. *Auster*, and S. *Bede*, doe all three affirme constantly and with vniforme assent, that sin is nothing else but ἀνομία, and a transgression of the lawe of God.

Seuenthly, that by the flatte doctrine not onely of Saint *Bede*, but also of two famous popish writers (whose authoritie is euer most forcible against papists) *Dyonisius Carthusianus*, and *Nicholaus Lyranus*, iniquity is a mortall sinne, because it is against the eternall law, which is equity it selfe and the will of God.

Eightly, that our papists of Rhems, doe confute themselues vnawares, while they tell vs, that euery sinne is a declyning and swaruing from Gods law: but withall denie, that euery such swaruing from Gods law, is properly sinne. For, seeing Gods law is nothing els but his will, as is alrea-

die proued, the Papists must either confesse, that to swarue and decline from Gods will is properly sinne; or else, that to decline and swarue from Gods will, is consonant and agreeable to his will: which to hold, is not onelie most absurd, but withall implyeth flat contradiction.

Against this discourse of originall concupiscence in the regenerate, nothing in truth can bee alledged for the papists. Yet, to take away all wrangling, I will truely put downe the vpshot of our Rhemists, and frame my answere to the same. Thus do they write, Though in the 5. Chapter, verse. 7. the Apostle turne the speech, affirming euerie iniquitie to be sinne; yet there the Greeke woord is not the same as before, ἀνομία, but ἁμαρτία. By which it is plain that there he meaneth by iniquity, mans actuall and proper transgression, which must needs bee sinne. These are their words, to which I answere in this wise.

Rhemists in 1. John 3.

First, that though the Greeke woord bee different, yet is it equiualent, and so the sence all one. This to be so, *S. Austen* will testifie me in these worde: *Nemo dicat, aliud est peccatum, at q̃ aliud iniquitas. Nemo dicat, ego peccator homo sum, sed iniquus non sum. Omnis qui facit peccatum, & iniquitatem facit.* Let no man say, sinne is one thing, and iniquity another thing. Let no man say, I am a sinfull man, but not vnrighteous. For euery one that committeth sinne, committeth also iniquitie. Thus writeth *S. Austen*, and what he saith, the same say *Beda* and *Oecumenius*. Who as we see heere, doth plainely and expresly affirme, sin and iniquity to be all one. So that whatsoeuer is sinne, must also be iniquitie: and whatsoeuer is iniquity, the same likewise must be sin. Neither is it to the purpose to iterate their vsual song, because, as is already proued, *S. Ambrose* telleth them in another place, that this sin is committed against the will of man. These are his words: *Num quid quia inuitum hominem dicit peccare, immunis debet videri à crimine: quia hoc agit quod non vult, pressus vi potestatis? Non vtique. Ipsius enim vitio & desidia haec capta sunt. Quia enim mancipauit se per assensum peccato, iure illius dominatur.* Is therefore a man

Aug. in epist. Joan. tract. 4. tom. 9. 412.

Ambros. in 7. cap. ad Roman. p. 205.

cleere

cleere and free from sinne, because hee saith man sinneth against his will? because he doth that which he would not doe, being presſed with the violence of power? No truely: for theſe things began through his fault and negligence. For seeing he consented to be a slaue vnto sinne, sinne by right hath Dominion ouer him. Loe, a man is guiltie of sinne, yea euen of that sinne which hee doth against his will, and cannot auoide the same, that is of originall concupiscence. And S. *Ambroſe* yeeldeth a reason hereof, because this impossibilitie came of mans default. And this is the verie case of infants, as is alreadie said. Let the Reader here obserue seriously with me, that S. *Ambroſe* calleth this involuntarie concupiscence, *crimen*, a crime of mortall sinne.

Inuolũtarie in the act yet voluntarie in the cause.

Secondly, that S. *Bede* affirmeth not only all to be sinne which is iniquitie; but also reputeth the verie corruption of innocencie, which commeth of infirmitie, to bee sinne in Gods sight. Theſe are his expreſſe words: *Omnes qui peccant prauaricationis rei sunt; hoc est, non solum illi qui data sibi scriptæ legis scita contemnunt, sed & illi qui innocentiam legis naturalis quam in protoplasto omnes accepimus, siue infirmitate, siue negligentia, siue etiam ignorantia corrumpunt.* All that sinne, are guiltie of preuarication or transgreſſion of the lawe; that is, not onely they which contemne the precepts of the written law giuen them, but they also, which either of infirmitie, or of negligence, or of ignorance, corrupt the innocencie of the law of Nature, which we all receiue in the Protoplast (*Adam.*)

Beda vbi supr.

S. *Ambroſe* in another place iumpeth with *Bede* in theſe words: *Non discreuit concupiscentiam hanc à peccato, sed miscuit, hoc significans, quia eum nec suspicio quidem esset istud non licerè apud deum, cognouit inquit, esse peccatum. Sub sua persona, quasi generalem agit causam. Lexitaq; concupiscentiã prohibet, quæ propterea quod oblectamento est, non putabatur esse peccatũ.* He hath not discerned this concupiscence from sin, but hath coupled it with sin, signifying thereby, that when there was not so much as any suspition, that this thing was not lawfull before God, I knew, saith he, that it is sin. Vnder

Ambroſ. in 7. c. ad Ro. p. 203

his owne person, hee pleadeth as it were the generall cause. The lawe therefore forbiddeth concupiscence, which because it delighteth, seemeth not to bee sinne. Thus writeth S. *Ambrose*; whose words cannot possibly be vnderstood of any other concupiscence, than of that which is inuoluntarie and originall.

Thirdly, that their owne vulgar Latine text (which the late councell of Trent preferred before both the Hebrew and the Greeke, and commaundethall papists to vse it as authenticall and none other) hath the word (*iniquitas*) in both places; and doth call as well ἀδικία as ἀνομία, Iniquitie: these are the expresse words; *omnis iniquitas peccatum est*: All iniquitie is sinne. Loe, their owne translation (to which all Papists are tyed as a Beare to a stake) doth flatly confound them all, and saith plainely and expressely, That euery iniquitie is a sinne. And yet the Papists of Rhemes bluntishly and impudently defend the contrary, crying out with open mouthes, That some iniquitie is not sinne. The truth is this, that they are driuen to a *non plus*, and cannot tell in the world what to say against this doctrine of concupiscence in the regenerate. For both ἀνομία and ἀδικία is truly and fitly termed *iniquitas* or iniquitie. Which (but that I study to bee briefe) I could shew by a thousand testimonies, out of S. *Austen*, S. *Ambrose*, and S. *Bede*. Answere therefore O papists if ye can, or if ye dare not, because ye cannot, then reclaime your selues, and yeeld vnto the truth for shame. I challenge you, and adiure you, if your hearts faile you not, and if your owne consciences condemne you not, to send me an answere to this short challenge, which I haue compiled very briefely so once to prouoke you to the often combat, which I haue now many yeares expected at your hands, and could neuer yet finde so much courage in any of you all. Wherefore to seale vp the veritie of this article, as an vndoubted truth, I will here adde for the complement, as a most delicat post-past, to satisfie the longing appetites of the Iesuit *Parsons*, the Archpriest *Blackwell*, and all the traiterous crew of that Iesuited

1. Ioan. 5. v. 17

Iesuited brotherhood; the flat testimonie of their Saint *Thomas Aquinas*, whose doctrine they are bound to defend, beleeue, and approoue, and may not in any case refuse or deny the same: these are his expresse words; *Dicendum quod illud quod homo facit sine deliberatione rationis non perfectè ipse facit; quia nihil operatur ibi id quod est principale in homine vnde nõ est perfectè actus humanus, & per consequens non potest esse perfectè actus virtutis vel peccati. sed aliquid imperfectum in genere horũ. Vnde talis motus sensualitatis rationem perueniens, est peccatum veniale, quod est quiddam imperfectum in genere peccati.* We must answere, that that which mã doth without the deliberation of reason, he doth it not perfectly, because that which is the chiefest in man, worketh nothing there: wherfore it is not perfectly mans act, & cõsequently it cannot be perfectly the act of vertue or of sinne, but some vnperfect thing in this kinde. Whereupon it commeth, that such a motion of sensualitie preuẽting reason, is a venial sin, which is a certaine imperfect thing in the nature of sinne. *Aquinas. 1. 2. q. 74. art. 3. 3.*

Thus writeth *Aquinas*, out of whose words I note these important obseruations. First, that this *Aquinas*, is a popish canonized Saint. Secondly, that for his great learning hee was surnamed, *Doctor Angelicus*, The Angelicall Doctor. Thirdly, that Pope *Vrbanus* the fourth, and Pope *Innocentius* the fift, did so admire and reuerence the excellent learning of this famous schoole-doctor (who was a learned Clarke indeede) that they confirmed his doctrine for authenticall, and gaue it the fifft place after the canonicall Scripture. Fourthly, that this great doctor, so highly renowned in the Romish Church, that no Papist may deny or gainesay that which hee hath written, graunteth freely, teacheth plainely, and auoucheth constantly, that the inordinate motion of sensualitie which goeth before reason, is properly a sinne, though but a veniall sinne, as hee tearmeth it. For it is one thing, to be a sinne perfectly; another thing, to bee a sinne properly. A veniall and little sinne is as well, and as truly a sinne, as a mortall and great sinne, as the Papists terme them. For hee is as truly and properly a

theefe

theefe that stealeth a lambe or a goose, as he that stealeth an oxe or a horse, though not a theefe in so high degree. For mortall and veniall sinnes (as the papists tearme them) doe onely differ, *Secundum magis & minus*, according to more and lesse. But in truth, euery sinne is mortall, as I haue alreadie proued in my booke of Motiues. Answere ô Papists, if ye can; if not, repent for shame.

Add to this the sixt article, and note it well.

The fift Article. Of the condigne so supposed merite of workes.

THe papists either of ignorance or of malice, do most vnchristianly slander the professors of Christs Gospell, as though they were enemies to good workes: when in deed, they both thinke, preach, and write, more Christianly, more religiously, and more sincerely, than the papists doe, of and concerning godly actions and good workes. In regard hereof before I come to the maine point of that, which I purpose to oppugne in this article: I graunt first of all, that though good workes neither doe nor can goe before iustification; yet they euer follow (as the fruites follow the tree) the persons that are freely iustified by Gods mercie in Christ Iesus, for his merits and condigne deserts.

I graunt secondly, that though good workes goe not before iustification; yet doe they so necessarilie goe before saluation, that no man without them can attaine eternall life, when possibilitie is graunted to do them.

I graunt thirdly, that good workes are the true effects of predestination; by which the children of God make their saluation sure vnto themselues, and manifest vnto the world. Yet this notwithwanding, I hold constantlie, beleeue stedfastly, and affirme Christianly, that albeit good workes are the effects of predestination, and necessary fruites of faith and iustification; yet neyther are they the cause of predestination, nor of iustification, neyther doe they, or can they merit *ex condigno*, eternall life or glorie. I say (merit *ex condigno*) because I willingly graunt with the auncient writers and holy Fathers, that good workes in a godly sense may be said to merit; that is to say, to impetrate fauour and reward at Gods hands, for his mercie and promise sake, who hath promised not to leaue vnrewarded, so much as one cup of cold water giuen in his name; but they can neuer truely be saide to merite, for any worthinesse or condigne desert of the works that are done. Against which last part, I contend with the Papists at this present; and namely, against the late decree of the late Romish Counsell of Trent, whose expresse words are these; *Si quis dixerit, hominis iustificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, vt non sint etiam bona ipsius iustificati merita; aut ipsum iustificatum, bonis operibus quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam & Iesu Christi meritum, cuius membrum viuum est, fiunt, non verè mereri augmentum gratiæ, vitam æternam, & ipsius vitæ æternæ, si tamen in gratia decesserit, consecutionem, atq; etiam gloriæ augmentum, anathema sit.* If any shall say, that the good workes of the iustified man are so the gifts of God, that they be not also the good merites of him that is iustified: or that the iustified man, by his good works which hee doth by the grace of God, and merit of Christ Iesus, whose liuely member hee is, doth not truely merit the increase of grace, eternall life, and the consequution of the same eternall life, if hee shall depart hence in grace, and also the augment of glory, let him be accursed.

Mat. 10. *ver.* 42. *Iac.* 1. 12.

Concil. Trid. sess. 6. *die.* 13. *Ian. can.* 32.

Heere wee see the flat doctrine of the Romish Church,

which whosoeuer will not beleeue stedfastly, must bee damned euerlastingly, and with fire and faggot bee sent packing speedily. Yet that this doctrine is most absurd in it selfe, most blasphemous against the free mercie of God, and most iniurious to the inestimable merits of our Lord Iesus; I vndertake by Gods assistance, to prooue by such cleere and euident demonstrations, as shall be able to satisfie all indifferent readers, and to put the Papists to silence for euer in this behalfe.

The first reason, drawne from holy Scriptures.

Rom. 6. v. 23. THe first place of holy Scripture, is contained in these words; τὸ δὲ χαρίσμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. But the gift of God is life euerlasting in Christ Iesus our Lord. This text of scripture doth plainely conuince, that life eternall cannot be condignely atchieued by the workes of man; for being the free gift of God, it can no way be due to the merite of mans worke. The Rhemists to extenuate the cleereneſſe of this text, and as it were to hide and conceale the euidencie thereof, do translate for the gift of God, the grace of God, following their old vulgar Latin edition. Which translation though in this place it may be admitted, yet doth it not sufficiently expresse the efficacie of the originall word χάρισμα which signifieth a gift freely bestowed; for which respect, their owne famous linguist *Arias Montanus*, who was the onely man chosen as most sufficient for the translation of the old Testament out of the Hebrew, and of the new out of Greeke, and imployed by the king of Spaine for that only end, did not translate *gratia* but *donatio*; not grace, but donation (or free gift.) Now, let vs see and veiw the iudgement of the holy fathers, vpon this portion of holy writ. S. *Throdoret* hath these words; *Hic non dicit mercedem, sed gratiã: est enim Dei donum vita æterna, & si quis enim summã & absolutã iustitiam præstiterit, temporalibus laboribus æterna in æquilibrio non respondent.* He saith not here reward, but grace; for eternall life is the gift of God: For although

Theod. in ca. 6. ad Rom.

one

one could perfourme the higheſt and abſolute iuſtice, yet eternally ioyes being weighed with temporall labours, are nothing anſwerable.

Saint *Cryſoſtome* hath theſe words; *Non eundem ſeruat oppoſitorum ordinem. Non enim dicit, merces benefactorum veſtrorum vita æterna, ſed donum Dei vita æterna; vt oſtenderet, quod non propriis viribus liberati ſint, neq; debitũ, aut merces, aut laborum ſit retributio, ſed omnia illa ex diuino munere gratuitò acceperint.* He doth not obſerue the ſame order of oppoſites. For he ſaith not, eternall life is the reward of your good workes; but, eternall life is the gift of God: that he might ſhewe, that they are not deliuered by their owne ſtrength or vertues; and that it is not a debt, or a wages, or a retribution of labours, but that they haue receiued all thoſe things freely of the gift of God. *Chryſoſt. in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Origen writeth thus, vpon the ſame words; *Deum verò non erat dignum militibus ſuis ſtipendia, quaſi debitum aliq; dare; ſed donum & gratiam quæ eſt vita æterna, in Chriſtro Ieſu domino noſtro.* But it was not a thing worthy beſeeming God, to giue ſtipends to his ſouldiours, as a due debt or wage: but to beſtow on them a gift or free grace, which is eternall life in Chriſt Ieſus our Lord. *Origen in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Saint *Ambroſe* hath theſe words: *Sicut enim ſequentes peccatum acquirunt mortem, ita & ſequentes gratiam Dei, id eſt, fidem Chriſti quæ donat peccata, habebunt vitam æternam.* For as they that follow ſinne, gaine death: ſo they that follow the grace of Chriſt, that is, the faith of Chriſt which forgiueth ſinnes, ſhall haue eternall life. *Ambroſ. in ca. 6. ad Rom.*

Theophilact. hath theſe words: *Gratiam autem, non mercedem dixit à Deo futurum, perinde acſi inquiat: non enim laborum accipitis premia, ſed per gratiam fiunt hæc omnia in Chriſto Ieſu, qui hæc operatur & factitat.* He ſaid grace, not wages, was to come from God: as if he ſhould ſay, for ye receiue not rewards of labours, but all theſe things are done by grace in Chriſt Ieſus, who worketh and doth them. *Theoph. in cap. 6. Rom.*

Anſelmus and *Photius* haue the ſame woordes in effect, which I omit in regard of brevity.

By these manifold testimonies of the holy fathers, the doctrine which I defend, is cleere and euident: *viz.* that eternall life is the free guift of God, and is not merited or purchased by desert of man: that eternall life is not a due debt, a deserued wages, or retribution of mans labours, but proceedeth wholy and solie of the free mercie and grace of God; that mans workes waighed in the ballance, with the ioyes of heauen, are nothing at all answerable vnto them. To which Fathers, I will adde the verdict of *Paulus Burgensis*, a very famous popish Spanish Bishop. These are his words: *Noluit ergo dicere, stipendium iustitiæ vita æterna: sed maluit dicere, gratia Dei vita æterna: quia eadem merita quibus redditur, non a nobis sunt, sed in nobis à Deo facta sunt per gratiam.* He would not therfore say, eternall life is the stipend of iustice: but he had rather say, eternall life is the grace of God: because the same merits to which it is rendered, are not of our selues, but wrought in our selues by God through grace.

Paulus Burg. addit. 2. in. 6. cap. ad Rom.

The second text of holy scripture, is contained in these words: I count that the afflictions of this present time, are not worthy of the future glorie which shall bee reuealed toward vs. Loe, all our *παθήματα*, all our passions, afflictions, and penalties that wee are able to endure in this life, are so farre from being meritorious of eternall life, that they are in no wise comparable to the same.

Rom. 8. v. 18.

Theodoretus doth liuely expresse this verity, in these most golden words: *Superant certamina coronæ, non comparantur cum laboribus remunerationes; labor enim paruus est, sed magnum lucrum sperat ur. Et propterea non mercedem, sed gloriam vocauit ea quæ expectantur.* The conflicts of the crowne doe remaine, the labours are not comparable to the rewardes: for the labor is smal, but the gaine hoped for, is great. And therefore the thinges expected, are not called a reward, but glorie.

Theodor. in. 2. a. 8. ad. Rom.

Anselmus hath these words; *Hoc est, si quis pateretur omnes pœnarum acerbitates, quæ in tempore presentis vitæ sufferri possunt; non essent omnes illæ passiones dignum meritum ad consequutionem*

Anselmus in 8. cap. ad Rom.

sequutionem futuræ gloriæ, quæ ablato omni velamine reuelabitur in nobis. If one should suffer all kinds of torment which can be endured in this life: yet would not all those afflictions, or torments, or passions, be a sufficient and condigne merite, to attaine the future glory; which when euery vaile is taken out of the way, shall be reuealed in vs. Marke well these wordes in this famous Popish writer, because they are most important: for, seeing hee was a great papist, his proofe must needes be good against the Papists. Againe, his words are so cleere and manifest, that no euasion can haue place. For, hee saith in plaine and expresse tearmes; that all which is possible to bee done or endured in this world, cannot bee a worthy or condigne merite of eternall life. No answere in truth, can bee made hereunto; it iumpeth indeede with the true sence and meaning of Saint *Paul*.

The third place of holy Scripture, is contained in these wordes: Not by the works of iustice which we haue done, but according to his mercie hee hath saued vs, by the Lauer of regeneration and renouation of the holy Ghost. These are the Apostles wordes, euen as our Rhemists haue alledged them. By which words it is most cleere and apparant, that wee are not onely iustified, but also saued of meere mercy and the free gift of God. And consequently, that eternall life hath no merite on the behalfe of man. For after saluation once accomplished, all merite is vaine and needlesse. *Tit. 3.5.*

Anselmus hath these golden words; *Tunc saluos nos fecit, qui nostris meritis eramus perditione digni: non enim ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos, processit hæc salus: quia nulla opera iustitiæ feceramus, vnde salutem meruissemus; sed ipse secundum misericordiam suam saluos nos fecit, non secundum merita nostra nobis hanc salutem dedit.* Then did hee saue vs, who by our own merits deserued perditiō. For, this saluation came not from the works of iustice, which we haue don, because we had not done the works of iustice, by which we shuld merit saluation: but he according to his mercy saued vs, *Anselmus in tit. cap. 3.*

vs, & not according to our merits gaue he vs this saluation.

Dionys. in. ti. 3 This famous papist *Dionysius Carthusianus*, expoundeth Saint *Paul* euen as *Anselmus* did. These are his wordes: *Non ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos: id est, non propter merita nostra quæ nulla fuerunt, quia predictis peccatis eramus obnoxij: sed secundum suam misericordiam saluos nos fecit, à potestate diaboli & reatu æterni tormemti, merito suæ conuersationis & passionis.* Not of the works of righteousnesse which wee haue done; that is, not for our merits which were none at all, because we were subiect to the afore named sinnes: but according to his mercy hath he saued vs, from the power of the diuell and guilt of eternall torment, by the merite of his holy conuersation and passion. Loe, our saluation commeth not of mans merits, but of the merits of the son of God. This shall suffice for the first reason, which is drawne from the authoritie of holy writ.

The second reason, drawne from the authoritie of the holy Fathers.

SAint *Austen* hath many excellent testimonies in his workes, which doe euidently approoue and confirme this my doctrine, against the Popish supposed condigne merit of workes; but I will content my selfe, with one or two at this present. Thus doth hee write; *Virtus est charitas, qua id quod diligendum est diligitur: hæc in alijs maior, in alijs minor, in alijs nulla est; plenissima vero, quæ iam non possit augeri, quamdiu hic homo viuit, est in nemine: quamdiu autem augeri potest, profecto illud quod minus est quam debit, ex vitio est. Ex quo vitio, non est iustus in terra, qui faciat bonum, & non peccet. Ex quo vitio, non iustificabitur in conspectu Dei omnis viuens. Propter quod vitium, si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nosmetipsos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est. Propter quod etiam quantum libet profecerimus, necessarium est nobis dicere; dimitte nobis debita nostra, cum iam omnia in baptismo dicta, facta, cogitata, dimissa sint.* Charitie is a vertue, with which wee loue that that ought to be loued. This in some is more, in others lesse, in others none

Aug. ad Hier. epist. 29.

at

at all; but the perfect charitie, which cannot bee increased while a man heere liueth, is found in none: so long as it can bee encreased, that doubtlesse which is lesse then it should be, proceedeth of sinne; by teason of which sinne, there is not one iust vpon earth, that doth good and sinneth not: by reason of which vice, if wee say wee haue no sinne, wee deceiue our selues, and the truth is not in vs: by reason of which sinne, how much soeuer wee profite, yet must wee say of necessitie. Forgiue vs our trespasses, euen after that all our thoughts, wordes, and workes, are forgiuen in baptisme. Thus writeth Saint *Austen*, that mightie pillet of Christs Church: out of whose most golden wordes, I note sundry excellent documents to the great comfort of the faithfull, and to the euerlasting confusion of all impenitent Papists. For first Saint *Austen* saith, that no man can haue charitie in that perfect degree, which the Law requireth. Secondly, that the want thereof, proceedeth of that vice that is inherent in vs. Thirdly, that by reason of this vice, euery man is a sinner. Fourthly, that by reason thereof, none liuing can bee iustified in Gods sight. Fiftly, that by reason thereof, whosoeuer saith hee hath no sinne, is a flat lyer. Sixtly, that how vertuously soeuer wee liue, yet must wee desire God to forgiue vs our sinnes, by reason of this inherent vice. Seauenthly, that we must thus pray, euen after all sinnes bee forgiuen vs in our baptisme.

Againe, the same Saint *Austen* in another place hath theese words; *Iustitia modo nostra ex fide, iustitia perfecta non est nisi in Angelis, & vix in Angelis si Deo comparentur; tamen si qua perfecta iustitia animarum & spirituum est, quos Deus creauit, in Angelis sanctis, iustis, bonis, nullo lapsu auersis, nulla superbia cadentibus, sed manentibus semper in contemplatione verbi Dei, & nihil aliud dulce habentibus nisi à quo creati sunt, in ipsis perfecta iustitia est, in nobis autem ex fide cœpit esse secundum spiritum.* Our Iustice is now of faith, ther is no perfect iustice but in the Angels, and scarce in the Angels, if they bee compared to God. Yet if there bee

Augu. in epist Joan. tract. 4. tom. 9.

be any perfect iustice of soules and spirits, which God hath created in the holy Angels, iust, good, by no lapse auerted, by no pride falling, but euer abiding in the contemplation of the word of God, and thinking nothing sweete, but him onely which created them: in them iustice is perfect, but in vs (it is not perfect) it is onely begun of faith according to the spirit. Thus saith Saint *Austen*, telling vs very plainely, that there is no perfect iustice in man: but doubtlesse, where no perfect iustice is, there can be no condigne merite of eternall life.

Ambr. lib. 10. epist. 84. to. 3. S. *Ambrose* is consonant to S. *Austen*, who writeth in this manner: *Caro contra spiritum, & contra carnem spiritus concupiscit; nec inuenitur in vllo hominum tanta concordia, vt legimentis lex quæ membris est insita, non repugnet. Propter quod ex omnium sanctorum persona accipitur, quod Ioannes Apostolus ait: si dixerimus quoniam peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, & veritas in nobis non est.* The flesh (saith S. *Ambrose*) coueteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: neyther can there be found in any man such concord or agreement, that the law which is ingrafted in the members, fighteth not against the law of the mind. And for that cause Saint *Iohns* words are taken as spoken in the person of all Saints; If we say we haue no sinne, wee deceiue our selues, and there is no truth in vs.

Thus writeth S. *Ambrose*; out of whose wordes I note first, that concupiscence mooueth rebellion against the spirit, in the holiest man vpon earth. Secondly, that this rebellion is sinne in euery one: For S. *Iohn* speaketh of sinne indeede. Thirdly, that no man liuing is free from sinne; and consequently, that none liuing in this pilgrimage of mortalitie, can condignely merite eternall life.

Chrisost. de. compunct. cor. lib. 2. tom. 5. col. 592. S. *Chrysostome* is consonant to S. *Ambrose*, and S. *Austen*: these are his words: *Etsi millies moriamur, etsi omnes virtutes animi expleamus: nihil digna geramus ad ea quæ ipsi percepimus à Deo.* Though we dye a thousand times, & though we accomplish all vertues of the minde: yet doe we nothing worthy of those things which we receiue of God.

Theophilact

Theophilact saith in this manner: *Seruauit nos æternum, non ex operibus quæ fecimus, hoc est, neq; fecimus opera iustitiæ, neq; per hec conseruati sumus, sed vniuersam salutem bonitas ipsius atq; clementia operata est.* He hath saued vs eternally, not of the workes which we haue done, that is, neither haue we done the works of iustice, neither are we saued by them, but his goodnes and his clemency hath wrought our saluation wholly. *Theophil. in 3. cap. Tib.*

Now to knit vppe this reason with all consents in one, I will here set downe the flat and plaine report of a famous Frier and Popish bishop, in that booke which he dedicated to Pope *Sixtus* the fift: *Post humilimam sanctorum pedum deosculationem.* These are the words: *Eodem etiam modo considerantes omnes alij doctores sancti naturalem solummodo bonorum operum valorem, & illum à valore & iusta vitæ æternæ æstimatione longissimè distare perpendentes, prudenter dixerunt, opera nostra non esse meritoria aut digna vitæ æternæ. Ex lege tamen, siue conuentione, siue promissione facta nobiscum, opera bona hominis cum adiutario gratiæ dei fiunt æternæ vitæ digna, & illi æqualia; quæ seclusa illa dei promissione, quæ passim in sacris literis reperitur, fuissent tanto premio prorsus indigna.* All other holy doctors also, considering after the same manner the naturall value onely of good works, and perceiuing that it is exceeding farre distant from the value and iust estimation of eternall life, said wisely, That our works are not meritorious nor worthy of eternall life. Yet for the couenant & promise made vnto vs, the good works of man with the helpe of Gods grace, are worthie of eternall life, and equall with it; which for all that, that promise of God which is frequent in the Scripturure, set aside, were altogether vnworthy of so great reward. *Ioseph Angles in 2. lib. s. pag. 103.*

Lo, this Fryer granteth, that all the holy Fathers are against the Papists.

Thus saith our popish bishop, our holy Frier, euen to the Pope himselfe, after the humble kissing of his most holy feete. Who though he bestirre himselfe more than a little, to establish the condigne merite of mans woorkes, yet doth he in his owne kind of dispute and reasoning, vtterly confute and confound himselfe. For first, he graunteth,

teth, that not onely S. *Chrysostome*, but all the rest of the holy fathers with him (marke well, gentle reader) affirme constantly and vniformely with one voyce and assent (a testimonie almost incredible to proceede from the mouth of a Papist, so deere to the Pope) That good workes neither are meritorious, nor worthie of eternall life. Secondly, he graunteth freely, that the best workes considered in their owne nature and kind, are vnworthy of eternall life. Thirdly, hee graunteth willingly, and telleth the Pope roundly (*post deosculationem pedum*, but after the kissing of his feete) that good workes, euen as they proceede of grace and assistance of the holy ghost, are for all that altogether vnworthy of eternall life, if Gods promise and free acceptation be set apart. Which three points doubtlesse, are all that wee desire to bee graunted, concerning the doctrine of good workes. And consequently, though the papists neuer cease to impeach, accuse, slaunder, and condemne vs in this behalfe: yet do we defend nothing herein (as is euident to the indifferēt reader) but euen that which their owne best doctors in their printed bookes doe teach vs; yea, in those very bookes which are dedicate to the Pope himselfe, and that with the solemne and religious deosculation of his holy feet. The conceits which bishop Frier *Ioseph* alledgeth, to make good his imagined condigne merit of workes, are very childish and too too friuolous. For first, where he saith, that the fathers speake of good workes, onely in respect of their naturall value, as he tearmeth it; I answere, that that silly glosse is onely inuented by him and his fellowes, to saue the life of their beggerly doctrine, if it would be. For no such thing can be found in any one of all their bookes. Nay, our Frier bishop confuteth himselfe vnawares (of such force is the truth) whē he graunteth that good workes done in grace, are vtterly vnworthy of heauen, if Gods promise be set apart. Where I wish the reader to obserue seriously the word (*prorsus*, vterlў) which is indeede his owne, and most emphaticall against himselfe.

The papists graunt as much as we desire.

Their

Their highly renowned Abbot and canonized Saint *Bernardus* shall tell them the truth, and giue the vpshot of the game: these are his expresse words: *Iam vero de æterna vita scimus, q3 non sunt cõdignæ passiones huius tẽporis ad futurã gloriam, nec si vnus omnes sustineat. Neq3 enim talia sunt hominum merita, vt propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex iure, aut deus iniuriam aliquam faceret, nisi eam donaret.* Now touching eternall life, we know that the sufferings of this time are not worthy of the glory to come; no, not if one man could sustaine all. For the merits of men are not such, that for them eternall life is due by right, or that God should doe some iniury, if he gaue it not. *Bernard. ser. in annunc. B. M. V. pag. 160. tom. 1.*

The same *Bernard* in another place hath these expresse words; *Deest gratia, quicquid meritis deputas. Nolo meritum, quod gratiam excludat. Horreo quicquid de meo est, vt sim meus; nisi quod illud magis forsitan meum est, quod me meum facit Gratia reddit me mihi iustificatum gratis, & sic liberatum à seruitute peccati.* It derogateth from grace, whatsoeuer thou ascribest to merite. I will haue no merite that excludeth grace. I abhorre whatsoeuer is of mine owne, that I may be mine own, vnlesse perchance that is more mine own which maketh me mine owne. Grace iustifieth me to my selfe freely, and so deliuereth me from the bondage of sin. *Bern. in can. serm. 67. pag. 1003. tom. 1.*

The same *Bernard* in another place hath these expresse words: *Sic non est, quod iam quæras quibus meritis speremus bona, præsertim cum audias apud prophetã: non propter vos, sed propter me ego faciam, dicit dominus. Sufficit ad meritum scire quod non sufficiant merita. Sed vt ad meritum satis est, de meritis non presumere: sic carere meritis, satis ad iudicium est.* So there is no cause, that thou shouldest now aske by what merits we hope for glory, especially, since thou heares the Prophet say, I will do it, saith the Lord, not for your sake, but for mine owne. It is sufficient to merite, to know that our merites are not sufficient. But as it is ynough to merite, not to presume of merites, so to want merites, is ynough to iudgement. *Bern. in cant. serm. 68. p. 1006*

Out of the most excellent testimonies of this famous pa-

Pist, I note many worthy lessons for the benefit of the Reader. First, that nothing which man can doe or suffer in this life, is worthy of the ioyes of heauen. Secondly, that heauen is not due to any man for his owne deserts. Thirdly, that God should doe no man wrong, no, not the best liuer on earth, if hee should debarre him from the ioyes of heauen. Fourthly, that whatsoeuer is ascribed to mans merite, the same is derogatory to Gods grace. Fiftly, that *Bernard* renounceth all merite, which excludeth grace, that is to say, all merit of mans workes whatsoeuer: for so himselfe expounded himselfe. Sixtly, that he abhorreth whatsoeuer is his owne, and so he denieth any thing within himselfe to be meritorious, or worthy of eternall life. Seuenthly, that the most sufficient merit in man, is this, *viz.* to know and confesse, that our merits are no merits indeed. Eightly, that to want merits, is ynough for mans condemnation. Which last obseruation doth fitly expound that which I vttered in the beginning of this article, to wit, that the word (merit) in that sence in which the Fathers vse it, is not to be reiected, though in these our daies it commonly be abused. For to want merits in their sence (as *Bernard* here declareth euidently) is to haue no good workes: which good workes I affirme willingly, both with the old and late writers of best account, to be so necessary to attaine eternall life, as the vsuall, ordinary, and vndoubted meanes, by which God decreed from eternity freely for his owne name sake, to bring his chosen and elect to saluation; that without the same, none haue been, are, or shall be saued world without end; if, as I said in the beginning, time be graunted to doe them.

The third reason, drawne from the doctrine of the best approued Papists, and their renowned schoole-doctors.

Aquin. 12. q. 114. art. 1. in corp.

THomas *Aquinas* (whose doctrine no Papist may gainesay or refuse) hath these expresse words: *Manifestũ est autem, quod inter deũ & hominem est maxima inæqualitas, in infinitum enim distant; totum quod est hominis bonum, est à deo; vnde*

vnde nõ potest hominis à deo esse iustitia secundũ absolutam æqualitatem sed secundum proportionem quandam; in quantum scilicet vterq; operatur secundum modum suum. Modus autem & mensura humanæ virtutis homini est à Deo, & ideo meritum hominis apud deũ esse non potest, nisi secundum presuppositionẽ diuinæ ordinationis; ita scilicet, vt id homo consequatur à Deo per suam operationem quasi mercedem, ad quod Deus ei virtute operandi destinauit. It is manifest, that betweene God and man there is exceeding great inequality, as which do differ in infinit; all the good that man hath, is of God. Wherefore mans iustice receiued of god, cannot be according to absolute equalitie, but after a certaine proportion, to wit, in as much as either worketh according to his condition Now, man hath the measure and condition of his vertue from God; and therefore mans merit cannot be with God, saue onely according to the supposall of Gods holy ordinance; so forsooth, that man may attaine that at gods hand by his working, as a reward, to which god hath designed to him the faculty of and power working.

Thus writeth their grand master Papist *Aquinas*, who vtterly ouerthroweth all popish merit, as it is this day defended and beleeued in the Church of Rome. For first *Aquinas* telleth vs (marke well, for this is a weighty point) that where there is not perfect equality, there can bee no merit properly. Secondly, he graunteth freely, that there is infinite inequality between God and man, as euery child knoweth to be true. Thirdly, he freely confesseth, that mans iustice not absolute, but imperfect. Fourthly, he graunteth willingly, that man doth merit nothing in gods sight, saue onely by way of his free acceptation. Fiftly, he confesseth in like manner, that eternall life is not properly hire, but as it were hire, *quasi mercedem*; and that, by reason of the same free acceptation.

Durandus, a very famous popish Schoole-doctor, hath these expresse words: *Tale meritum de condigno inuenitur inter homines sed non est hominis ad deum. Quod patet, quã quod redditur potius ex liberalitate dantis, quã ex debito operis, non* *Durand. in. 2. sf. dist. 17. q. 2. in med.*

cadit sub merito de condigno strictè & propriè accepto. Sequitur; quod si quis dicat, quod quamuis deus non constituatur nobis debitor ex aliquo nostro opere, constituitur tamen debitor ex sua promissione, quam exprimit scriptura; non valet propter duo. Primum est, quod promissio diuina in scripturis sanctis nõ sonat in aliquam obligationem, sed insinuat meram dispositionem liberalitatis diuinæ. Secundum est, quod quod redditur, non redditur ex debito operis, sed ex promissione precedente, non quod redditur ex merito operis de condigno, sed solum vel principaliter ex promisso. Et ita non est illud debitum, de quo loquimur. Et sic patet, quod meritum de condigno strictè & proprie sumptum, viz. pro actione voluntaria, propter quam operanti debitur merces ex iustitia, sic quod si nõ reddatur, ille ad quem pertinet reddere, iniustè facit, & est simpliciter & propriè iniustus, non est hominis ad deum. Et ideo propter tale meritum, cum sit homini simpliciter impossibile, non est necesse in nobis ponere gratiam, vel charitatem habitualem. Such condigne merit is found among men, but is not betweene God and man. Which hereby is cleere, becauſe that which is rendered rather of the liberality of the giuer, than of debt due to the woorke, falleth not vnder condigne merit, properly ſo called. If any ſay, that though God become not our debtor by reaſon of our worke, yet is he made our debtor by reaſon of his promiſe, which the Scripture expreſſeth: that anſwere is of no force for two reſpects. Firſt, becauſe Gods promiſe in the Scriptures doth not ſound to any bond, but inſinuateth the meere diſpoſition of Gods liberality. Secondly, becauſe that which is giuen, is not giuen for the debt ariſing of the worke, but of promiſe that went before; not that it is rendered for the condigne merit of the worke, but onely or principally for his promiſe ſake. And ſo there is not that debt of which wee ſpeake. So then it is cleere, that condigne merit, properly ſo called, *viz.* for a voluntarie action, for which reward is due of iuſtice to the worker, ſo that if it be not rendered, he to whome it appertaineth to giue it, doth vniuſtly, and is ſimply and properly vniuſt, is not betweene God and man. And therefore for ſuch a merit,

ſeeing

seeing it is simply impossible to man, there is no neede to put in vs grace or charity habituall. Thus saith M. *Durand:* out of whose words I note first, that condigne merit cannot bee betweene God and man. Secondly, that eternall life is giuen of Gods free liberality, not of any duty due to the works that we doe. Thirdly, that God rewardeth vs principally for his promise sake, and not for any thing wee either haue done, or can do. Fourthly, that condigne merite is so farre aboue mans capacity, that no man can by any possiblity haue it. And consequently, that the late popish doctrine is impossible.

Gregorius Ariminensis, Marsilius, Thomas Waldensis, Paulus Burgensis, and *Eckius*, fiue most zealous papists doe all with one assent affirme very cóstantly, that mans works are not meritorious of eternall life, how holy soeuer the mã be. *Apud Joseph. Angl. in 2. s. dist. 27. art. 2. p. 105.*

Dominicus Soto a zealous Monke and famous popish writer, telleth the papists roundly, and teacheth them gratuely, that no pure man is able to make condigne satisfaction for his sinnes; and so *à fortiori*, against his will and meaning, that no man can by condigne merite attaine eternall life. These are his expresse words; *Perfecta satisfactio est illa, cuius valor & pretium totum emanat à debitore, nulla vel perueniente, vel interueniente gratia creditoris; taliter vt sit redditio aequualentis alias indebiti voluntaria.* Perfect satisfaction is that whose value and price proceedeth wholly from the debtour, without either preuenting or interuenting grace of the creditour; so as the voluntary reddition bee of that which is equiualent, and not otherwise due. This is true doctrine which our Fryer *Soto* deliuereth to the world: he teacheth vs foure thinges. First, that the satisfaction must proceed wholy frõ the debtour. Secondly, that there must be no preuenting nor interuenting grace of the creditour. Thirdly, that there must be equiualent restitution. Fourthly, that that equiualent reddition must be a worke, which is otherwise not due. These foure conditions (which our popish M. *Soto* and *Dominican* fryer requireth in euery satisfaction) when any papist can find in any one of their me- *Soto, de nat. & grat. lib. 3. cap. 6. pa. 138.*

rits

rits or satisfactions, I will be their bondman, neither shall the popes holynesse be excepted. But to come to this bondage vpon this couenant, I am in no feare at all: For the ethnicke philosopher *Aristotle*, perceiued by the naturall discourse of right reason, That no man can euer make condigne compensation to God and his naturall parents. For which respect, *Aquinas* affirmeth constantly, that God is not simply and truely said to be debtor to vs, but to himselfe and to his owne promise, which he freely without all our deserts made vnto vs. And their great Schoole-doctour *Iosephus Angles*, after he hath disputed this question of condigne merit too and fro, *pro & contra*, doth in the end though vnawares, playnely confesse the selfe same doctrine, that I now intend to prooue. Hee telleth vs forsooth, that the price of euery thing may be equall to the value and worth of the same thing, two waies; first, of the nature of the thing; secondly, of the pact, couenant and promise of him that doth promise the same thing: for saith he, if one penny be the full value answereable to the labour; yet if a greater reward be promised, which farre exceedeth the worth and value of the woorke wrought, then that reward is also due by couenant. He addeth the reason thereof; *viz.* because the law of nature teacheth to keepe promises which farre exceede the value of the thing. And herevpon this great learned doctour concludeth roundly, that though our good workes come farre short of eternall life, if we respect the worthinesse thereof: yet doe they condignely merit the ioyes of heauen, if we respect the free promise of Christ Iesus. And this condignity of works, our fryer bishop, or bishop fryer; (as you will) calleth *æqualitas ex promissione tantum*, equalitie of promise onely. Now, I pray thee gentle reader, what childish wit is not able to penetrate the very bowles of this deepe diuinity? and yet is it the maine point and onely foundation, to which all papists doe and must appeale, in this weighty and most important question. For example sake, if thou wouldest wish me to lend thee my cloake, to

Aristot. in 8. ethnic. cap. 7.

Aquin. 12. q. 114. ar. 1. 3. m.

Iosephus Angles. in 2. sent. pag. 107.

defend

defend thee from a showre of raine, and promise to giue me an hundred pounds for the loane; then doubtlesse were it true to say, that after such loane, an hundred poundes were due vnto me: yet withall would it be most true also, that such loane of my cloake were not the condigne merit of that hundred pounds; but that it proceeded principally of that free gift and promise made vnto me, farre aboue my merit and desert: neither could my act be any way rightly tearmed, the condigne merit of that reward. And yet it is euident, that thus standeth the state of the question, betweene the condigne merit of mans workes, and the excellency of the ioyes of heauen. For I willingly graunt, that eternall life is due to the workes of Gods elect, and that it is as well the crowne of iustice, as of mercy: but withall I constantly affirme, that God bestoweth it on his elect freely for his own name sake, and not for any merit, worthines, or condignity of their workes. 2. *Tim.* 4. *v.* 8. *Iac.* 1. *v.* 12. *Rom.* 8. *v.* 18. *Rom.* 6. *v.* 23. *Psa.* 103. *v.* 4. *Psa.* 145. *v.* 9. *Iac.* 2. *v.* 83.

For this cause, their owne deere frier *Ioannes de Combis* teacheth this golden lesson: *Meritum condigni dicit æqualitatem meriti ad remunerationem: dico autem æqualitatem, non arithmeticam, sed geometricam: id est, non quantitatis, sed proportionis. Et hoc patet, quia Deus semper remunerat supra meritum, sicut punit citra condignum.* Condigne merit doth connotat the equality of merit, to the thing that is merited; I say equality, not arithmeticall, but geometricall, that is, not of quantity, but of proportion: And this is euident, because God euer rewardeth aboue our merits, as he punisheth lesse than wee deserue. Out of these wordes we see two things cleered: the one, that we deserue greater punishment for our sinnes, than God inflicteth vpon vs for the same: the other, that for our well doing we receiue greater reward, than our workes doe or can deserue. And consequently, that wee doe not condignely merit eternall life. *Ioan. de Combis lib. 5. theol. verit. cap.* 11.

For this cause saith their famous popish doctour *Nicolaus de Lyra*, in this manner: *Salus enim æterna, excedit totaliter facultatẽ naturæ humanæ. Propter quod nõ potest eam attingere,* *Lyra in 3. ca. tit.*

niſi ex largitate diuinæ miſericordiæ. For eternall life doth farre ſurmount and wholy exceed the facultie and power of mans nature. Wherefore, man can no way attaine vnto it, but onely by the liberalitie of Gods mercy.

Carthuſ. in. 6. cap. ad Rom. For this cauſe ſaith another popiſt Doctor *Dioniſius Carthuſianus*, in this manner: *Ex gratia, ſeu per gratiam Dei, datur iuſtis pro præmio vita æterna. Non hoc dicitur merita excludendo, ſed vt inſinuetur, quod principaliter aſcribendum ſit gratiæ Dei, qui etiam præmiat vltra condignum.* Eternall life is giuen for reward to the iuſt, of grace, or through the grace of God. This is not ſaid to exclude merites, but to inſinuate, that reward muſt principally be aſcribed to the grace of God, who rewardeth vs aboue our deſerts. Loe, this great Papiſt laboreth with maine and might, to ſtabliſh popiſh condigne merit of workes: who affirming more boldly than wiſely, that the elect doe merit eternall life; telleth vs with one breath, that the reward is aboue our merits and deſerts. And ſo vnwittingly and vnwillingly he confuteth himſelfe, and refelleth that doctrine, which he gladly would confirme.

To conclude, our Ieſuit and renowmed Cardinall, Fryer *Bellarmine*, who after mature deliberation and graue conſultation had with all the beſt learned Ieſuits in the world, and with the Pope himſelfe (whoſe faith iudiciall cannot faile, ſay they) ſaith all that poſſibly can be ſaid for the life of Poperie, doth with great grauitie and prudent ſagacitie in the name of all Papiſts, deliuer this doctrine vnto v;

Bellarm. de iuſtific. tom. 3. col. 1296. & col. 1298. *Quod vero attinet ad rem ipſam, Durandi ſententia, ſi nihil aliud vellet, niſi merita noſtra non eſſe ex condigno, ſiue ex iuſtitia abſolutè, ſed tantum ex hypotheſi, id eſt, poſita liberali Dei promiſſione, non eſſet reprobanda, ſequitur; reſpondeo, abſolutè non poſſe hominem à Deo aliquid exigere, cum omnia ſint ipſius; tamen poſita eius voluntate & pacto, quo nõ vult exigere à nobis opera noſtra gratis, ſed mercedem reddere iuxta proportionem operum, verè poſſumus ab eo mercedem exigere; quomodo ſeruus nõ poteſt abſolutè à domino ſuo vllũ præmiũ poſtulare, cũ omnia quæ ſeruus acquirit, domino ſuo acquirat; tamẽ ſi domino placeat*

donar

donare illi opera ſua & pro iiſdem tanquam ſibi non debitis mercedem promittere, iure mercedem pro ſuis operibus poſtulabit. Touching the matter it ſelfe, *Durands* opinion, if hee had no other meaning, but that our merits are not abſolutely iuſt and condigne, but hypothetically in reſpect of Gods liberall promiſe, were not to be reiected: I anſwere, that man cannot abſolutely exact any thing of God, ſeeing all things are Gods owne; neuertheleſſe, his will and couenant being made, that he will not exact our workes of vs freely, but will reward them according to their proportion: we may truely require hyre of him, like as a bondman cannot abſolutely require any reward of his Lord, ſeeing euery thing which the bondman gaineth, is gotten and gained to his maiſter: yet for all that, if it ſhall pleaſe his maiſter and Lord to beſtow his works on him, and to promiſe reward for the ſame, as if they were not due vnto him, then may the bond-ſeruant iuſtly demaund reward for his workes.

Thus ſaith the Ieſuit *Bellarmine*; and conſequently, this is all that all Papiſts ſay, or can ſay, for the life of popiſh doctrine. Out of whoſe wordes I note firſt, that his brother *Durands* opinion hath put him to his beſt trumpe. Secondly, that *Durands* opinion (as is alreadie prooued) is this: *viz.* that the merit of workes in the beſt liuer vpon earth, cannot truely and properly be called *meritum ex condigno*, condigne merit; but onely merit in way of acceptation, and in reſpect of Gods free mercye, and promiſe made vnto man without all deſerts. Thirdly, that *Bellarmine* graunteth this opinion in this ſenſe: For hee ſaith plainely, if *Durand* admit merit in reſpect of Gods promiſe, his opinion cannot be reprooued. Fourthly, that our Ieſuit maketh good that doctrine, which I here defend, as which is the ſelfe ſame, that *Durand* holdes. And conſequently, if *Bellarmine* and his popiſh fellowes and followers, would ſtand conſtantly to their owne doctrine, which they publiſh in printed bookes; wee and they ſhould ſoone agree, and theſe great controuerſies would haue

and end. Fourthly, that man cannot absolutely exact any thing at Gods hands, because all thinges are Gods owne. Fiftly, that in respect of Gods good pleasure and couenant freely made to man, wee may truely require reward of God. Yea, my selfe graunt, that we may not onely truely, but also iustly require reward at Gods hands, in regard of his promise freely made vnto vs. But I euer denye withall, that any reward is due to our best workes for any condigne merite or desert of or in our workes, Gods free acceptation, mercy, and promise set apart. For as Saint *Austen* grauely saith; *Va etiam laudabilis vita hominum, si remota misericordia discutias eam.* Woe euen to the best liuer vppon earth, if thou examine his life, thy mercy set apart. Answere ô Papists, if ye can; and if ye cannot, then repent, and yeeld vnto the truth for shame. I challenge you, I prouoke you to the combat; I adiure you all ioyntly, and euery one of you seuerally, for the credite of your cause, for the honour of your Pope, and the life of popish doctrine which now lyeth bleeding, and will shortly yeeld vp the Ghost, if some soueraigne remedie be not speedily prouided for the same.

Aug. li. 9. confess. cap. 13.

The

The sixt Article. Of the Popish distinction of mortall and *veniall sinnes.*

ALthough it bee true, that all sinnes are not equall, but one greater than another : and although it be also true, that in a good and godly sence, some sinne may be termed mortall, and some veniall ; which yet may more fitly bee called sins pregnant, and not regnant: neuertheleſſe moſt true it is, to the euerlasting confusion of all impenitent papists, that euery sinne is mortall of it owne nature, and onely veniall by way of Gods free acceptation and mercy, for his owne name sake, and merits of his deare sonne our Lord Iesus.

I prooue it first both briefely and euidently. For Christ himselfe telleth vs in his holy Gospell, that we must giue a straight account of euerie idle word in the generall day of iudgement. And for no other end doubtlesse must this account be made, but onely, because euery idle word is flatly against the law of God This the papists can neuer denie, it is euident to euery child. And yet must they likewise confesse, that idle words be those sinnes which they call venials. And consequently, they must confes against their wils, and against their professed Romish doctrine, that all sinnes are mortall, that is to say, against the law of God. *Mat.12.v.3.*

This doctrine of our Sauiour Christ Iesus is confirmed by the testimony of S. *Iohn* his beloued Apostle, where he telleth vs, that euery sinne is ἀνομία, that is, the transgressi- *1.Joh.3.v.4.*

on of Gods law, as is alreadie prooued at large in the fourth article of concupiscence. And the Hebrew word עון, which signifieth a declining from the right way, doth plainely confirme the same.

Rhemists in 1. John. 3. v. 4.

Secondly, because our Popish Remists confesse in plaine tearmes, that euery sinne is a swaruing from the law of God. For doubtlesse, that which swarueth from the law, is truely said to be against the law; but not agreeable to the Law.

Thirdly, because the famous popish Fryer and Romish Bishop, *Iosephus Angles* teacheth the same doctrine in his booke dedicated to the Pope himselfe. These are his owne expresse words: *Omne peccatum veniale est alicuius legis trãsgressio. Patet, quia, omne veniale est contra rectam rationam, & agere contra rectã rationem, est agere contra lagem naturalem, precipientem nõ esse à regula rectæ rationis deuiandum.* Euery sinne venial is the transgression of some law. This is cleere, becausse euery veniall sinne is against right reason; and to doe against right reason, is to doe against the law of nature, which commaundeth vs not to depart or swarue from the rule of right reason. Loe, euery veniall sinne is against right reason, and against the law of nature, which is giuen to euery one in his creation, in his birth or natiuitie.

Joseph. Angles in 4. sent. pag. 215.

Fourthly, because *Durandus* another famous papist, confuteth the late receiued popish opinion of *Thomas Aquinas* which the Pope and his Iesuites hold; to wit, that veniall sinnes are *præter legem, non contra:* Besides the law, but not against the law. These are *Durands* owne words: *Ad argumentum dicendum, quod omne peccatum est cõtra legem dei naturalem, vel inspiratam, vel ab eis deriuatam.* To the argument answere must be made, that euery sinne is against the law of God, either naturall, or inspired, or deriued from thẽ. And this opinion of M. *Durand*, is this day cõmonly defended in the popish Vniuersities and Schooles. So saith Frier *Ioseph*, these are his words: *D. Thomas & eius sectatores tenent, peccatum veninle non tam esse contra legem, quam præter legem. Sequitur; Duraudus tamen & alij permulti hanc sententiam impug-*

Duran. in. 2. sent. dist. 42. q. 6.

Ios. Ang. in 2. s. pag. 275.

impugnant, affirmantes peccata venialia esse contra mandata. Et hæc opinio modo in scholis videtur communior. S. *Thomas* and his fellowes hold; that a veniall sinne is not so much against the law, as besides the law. But *Durand* and many other impugne this opinion, auouching veniall sinnes to be against the commaundements. And this opinion seemeth now adaies to be more common in the schooles.

Here I wish the Reader to note by the way, out of the word (*modo* now adayes) the mutabilitie of Romish religion. For in that he saith (*modo*, now adayes) he giueth vs to vnderstand, that their doctrine is now otherwise than it was as old and in former ages. A note worthy to bee remembred. For the old Romane religion was catholicke, pure, and sound, and with it doe I not content: but I impugne late Romish faith and doctrine, which the Pope and his Romish Shoole-men haue brought into the Church.

Fiftly, because their canonized martyr *Iohn Fisher*, the late Bishop of Rochester, teacheth the same doctrine so plainely, as euery childe must needes perceiue the truth in that behalfe. These are his expresse words: *Quod peccatum veniale solum ex dei misericordia veniale sit, in hoc tecum sentio.* That a veniall sinne is onely veniall thr ough the mercie of God (and not of it owne nature, therein doe I agree vnto you. Thus saith our Bishop. And as he telleth me, that he agreeth with *Luther* therein: so doe I tell our Iesuites, that I agree with him, with *Durand*, *Almaine*, and the other papists, that teach the same doctrine. *Roffensis art. 32. adu. Luth.*

Sixtly, because *Gerson*, another famous popish writer, holdeth the same opinion. These are his expresse words: *Nulla offensa Dei est venialis de se, nisi tantum modo per respectum ad diuinam misericordiam, qui nõ vult de facto quamlibet offensam imputare ad mortem, cum illud posset iustissimè. Et ita cõcluditur, quod peccatum mortale & veniale in esse tali, non distinguuntur intrinsecè & essentialiter, sed solum per respectum ad diuinam gratiam, quæ peccatum istud imputat ad pœnam mortis, & aliud non.* No offence of God is veniall of *Io. Gers. de vita spiritual. lect. 1. part. 3. in. 2. ob.*

it

it owne nature, but onely in respect of Gods mercy, who will not *de facto*, impute euery offence to death, though he might doe it most iustly. And so I conclude, that mortall and veniall sinnes, as they be such, are not distinguished intrinsecally and essentially, but onely in respect of Gods grace, which assigneth one sinne to the paine or torture of death, and not another.

Thus writeth this famous popish bishop, who was a man of high esteeme in the Connsell of *Constance*. Whose onely testimony (if his words bee well marked) is able to confound the papists, and to strike them dead. For first, he telleth them plainely, that euery sinne is mortall of it owne nature. Secondly, that no sinne is veniall, saue onely in respect of Gods mercy. Thirdly, that God may most iustly (*iustissimè*) condemne vs for the least sinne we doe. Note seriously, gentle reader, the word (*iustissimè*.) Fourthly, that mortall and veniall sinnes are the same intrinsecally and essentially, and differ but accidentallie, that is to say, they differ in accident, but not in nature; in quantity, but not in qualitie; in mercy, but not in deformitie; in the subiect, but not in the obiect; in imputation, but not in enormitie; saue only, that the one is a greater mortall sinne than is the other. For (as *Gerson* auoucheth) we may iustly be damned for the least sinne of all, howsoeuer other papists doe flatter themselues in their cursed deformed venials.

Seuenthly, because sinne in generall is the transgression of Gods law, as *S. Ambrose* defineth it, yea, euery worde, deed, or desire against gods law, as *S. Austen* describeth it. Their words are set downe in the fourth article of this discourse.

Eightly, because the Iesuit *Bellarmine* vnawares confesseth the same against himselfe. These are his owne words: *Respondeo, omne peccatum esse contra legem dei, non positiuam, sed aternam, vt Aug. rectè docet. Omnis enim iusta lex, siue à deo, siue ab homine detur, ab aterna dei lege deriuatur. Est enim aterna lex, vt malum sit violare regulam.* I answere, that euery sinne is against the law of God, not positiue, but eternall,

Bellar. tom. 1. pag. 804.

ternall, as *Austen* teacheth rightly. For euery iust law, whether it be giuen of God, or of man, is deriued from the eternall law of God. For the eternall law is, that it is euill to offend against the rule. These are our Iesuites owne words, which (as euery childe can easilie discerne) doe euidently confute himselfe and his Romish doctrine. For first, vnder euerie sinne must needs be contained their veniall sinnes, or els some sinnes shall be no sinnes; which implieth flat contradiction. Secondly, he telleth vs that euery sinne, and consequenthe veniall sinnes, are against the eternall law of God. Thirdly, hee graunteth, that they are not onely besides the law, *sed contra legem*, but euen against the lawe. Fourthly, hence it is cleere and euident, that the lawe eternall is the chiefe and principall law of all other lawes, seeing from it all other lawes are deriued.

Ninthly, because the papists cannot possiblie yeeld any sound reason, why in the sinnes of theft, one shall bee mortall, and another veniall: For example sake, let vs suppose one at one time to steale so many egs as will make a mortall sinne by Romish doctrine; another at another time to steale so many as will make a veniall sinne by the same doctrine: then I demaund of our papists, Why God cannot iustly condemne the theefe to hell that stealeth but so many egs? and for all that can iustly condemne him to eternall torment, that stealeth but one onely egge aboue the said number. For this must they doe, and a good reason hereof must they yeeld (which I am well assured they can neuer do) or els confesse euerie sinne to be mortall, and so against their wils to subscribe to mine opinion. Answere ô papists if ye can; if ye cannot, repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

The ſeuenth Article. Of Po-
piſh vnwritten traditions.

THe Papiſts beare the world in hand, that many things neceſſarie for mans ſaluation, are not contained in the holy Scriptures of the old and new teſtament: & conſequently, that none can be ſaued but ſuch as beleeue their vnwritten traditions, and what their Pope telleth them. For the exact knowledge whereof, I put downe theſe propoſitions.

The firſt Propoſition, with the firſt reaſon.

THe written word or holy Scripture containeth in it ſelfe, euery doctrine neceſſarie for mans ſaluation. I prooue it, by the manifold texts both of the old and new teſtament, by the authoritie of the holy fathers, and by the teſtimonie of renowned and beſt approoued popiſh writers.

Ex Teſtamento veteri.

Deut.4.v.2. *Locus primus.* Ye ſhall not add to the word which I ſpeak vnto you, neyther ſhall yee take any thing away from it.

Deu.12.v.32. Againe thus, That which I command, that onely doe thou to the Lord. Neyther adde any thing, nor take any thing away.

Ioſ.1.v.7. *Ioſ.23.v.6.* Againe thus, Onely be thou ſtrong, and of a valiant courage, that thou maieſt obſerue and doe according to all the law which *Moſes* my ſeruant hath cõmanded thee. Thou ſhall not turne away from it, neyther to thee right hand, nor to the left. Bee carefull that yee keepe all things which are written in the booke of the law of *Moſes*, that

that ye decline not from them, neither to the right hand, nor to the left.

By these manifold texts we may see evidently, that the holy scriptures are most perfect, and that nothing may bee taken from them, neither any thing added to them. But doubtlesse, if all doctrine necessarie for mans saluation, were not sufficiently conteined in them, then of necessitie, many things should be added to them. *Bellarmine* (the mouth of all papists) answereth to these and the like places, that they are not spoken of the written word precisely, but of Gods word generally, which is partly written, and partly vnwritten. *Non ait, inquit ille, ad verbum quod scripsi, sed quod ego præcipio.* He saith not, (quoth our Iesuite) to the word which I haue written, but which I command. But doubtlesse, this is a miserable shift, and a very childish answere. For first, God himselfe wrote his owne wordes in two tables of stone, and then deliuered them to *Moses*. Yea, after *Moses* had broken the said tables, in his vehement zeale against Idolatrie; God commaunded *Moses* to hew two other tables of stone like to the first, in which he writ againe the words that were in the first tables, and commanded *Moses* to put them vp in an arke of wood. Secondly, *Moses* expounded the law of God to the Israelites at large. Which large explication of the law, God himselfe commaunded him to write, and to giue the same to the Israelites; that they might put it in the side of the arke of the couenant, and there keepe it for a witnesse against them. Thirdly, God commanded *Iosue* to keepe and obserue all things which were written in the booke of the law, which *Moses* had deliuered to the Leuites: charging him to meditate therein day and night, that he might doe according to the same. Fourthly, *Moses* telleth vs expresly, that the two tables written with the finger of God, contained all the wordes which the Lord spake to them in the mount out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly. Fiftly, God commanded that the king of the Israelites, so soone as he should be estab-

Bellarm.tom. col.183.A.B.

Deut.5.22.

Deut.9.17.

Deu.10.v.1.4

Deut.1.5.

Deu.31.v.19. 24.

Ios.1.v.8.

Deut.9.v.10.

Deu.17.v.18. shed in his throne, should write out the Deutronomie (or law repeated) in a Booke; according to the example, which the priests of the Leuiticall tribe should giue him, that hee might meditate therein all the daies of his life. Sixtly,

Ios.24.v.25. 26. *Iosue* made a couenant with the people, and gaue them a law in Sichem, and wrote all the wordes in the Booke of the law. Which words were nothing else but a repetition

Ios.1.v.7. Deu.5.a.1.per totum. Deut.11.1. of the couenant written by *Moses*; which couenant *Iosue* was commanded to obserue so strictly, that he might neither decline to the right hand, nor to the left. And the same law contained all those precepts, ceremonies, and iudgements, which God commaund *Moses* to teach the people of Israell.

Prou.30.v.6. *Locus secundus. Ne addas quicquam verbis eius (Dei) ne forte arguat te, & inueniaris mendax.* Thou must adde nothing to Gods words, lest he reprooue thee, and thou be found a lyer. This text Saint *Hierome* vnderstandeth of the holy scriptures, to which no man may adde any thing, bee it more, be it lesse. The scriptures therefore are most perfect and absolute, and containe euerie doctrine needefull for vs to know.

Esa.8.v.20. *Locus tertius. Ad legem magis, & ad testimonium: Quod si non dixerint iuxta verbum hoc, non erit eis matutina lux.* To the law, and to the testimonie. If they speake not according to this word, there is no matutine or true light in them.

Loe, they that refuse to be taught of Gods Prophet, who is the mouth of God; and seeke helpe at the deade, which is the illusion of Satan; are here reprooued as men voide of knowledge, and as blinde leaders of the blinde. And withall they are charged to seeke remedie in the word of God, where his will is declared. They and wee must euer in all doubts and difficulties, haue continuall recourse to the lawe of God; which law is here tearmed the testimonie, because it is the testification of Gods will toward man; because there is set downe, what God requireth of vs; because we may finde in it, whatsoeuer is necessary for vs to know. For the Prophet ioineth the testi-

monie

monie with the law, not as a thing distinct from it, but as an explication of the same. As if he had sayd, yee must in all doubts haue recourse to the lawe of God, because it is the testimonie of his holy will. Saint *Hierome* yeeldeth the like sense, and interpretation of this place; these are his words *Si vultis nosse quæ dubia sunt, magis væ legi & testimoniis traditæ scripturarum. Quia si noluerit vestra congregatio verbum domini quærere, non habebit luce veritatis. sed versabitur in erroris tenebris.* If ye will know the things that are doubtful, ye must haue recourse to the law, and to the testimonies of the Scriptures. For, if your people will not seeke Gods word, they cannot attaine the light of truth, but shall walke in the darkenesse of errour. *Hier. in 8. cap. Esa.*

Locus quartus. Mementote legis Mosis *serui mei, quam mandaui ei in Horeb ad omnem* Israel. Remember the law of *Moses* my seruant, which I commanded to him in Horeb to al *Israel.* Marke these words seriously, because they prooue euidently the question now in hand. For this *Malachias* being the last of Gods Prophets, and foreseeing by the spirite of God, that the Israelites should bee without Prophets a long time, euen till the comming of Christ; doth here exhort them diligently, to be mindfull of the lawe of *Moses.* As if he should sy; the time is at hand, when ye shall be destitute of Prophets, and therefore yee must marke well what the Law saith, and doe according to the prescript rule thereof. But what is the reason, why hee maketh no mention of the Prophets? doubtlesse, because all things (as you haue alreadie heard) are fully comprised in the written word of the Lawe. For, although the law and the Prophets were vntill *Iohn*; the one foretelling Christs comming by word, the other by tipes and figures: yet was the doctrine of the Prophets nothing else indeede, but an explication of the law; and consequently, *Malachie* willing the Israelites to remember the lawe of *Moses*, doth thereby sufficiently insinuate the doctrine of the Prophets, as who are nothing else but the interpreters of *Moses.* For from the law they might neither turne *Mal.* 4. *v.* 4. *Mat.* 11. *v.* 13

to the right hand nor to the left. That the law containeth the whole Christian Doctrine, necessarie vnto saluation, two famous popish Doctors (*Lyra* and *Dionysius Carthusianus*) doe testifie: whose words shall be alledged expressly, when I come to the places of the new Testament.

Lyra & Cart. in 23. ca. Mat.

Ex nouo Testamento.

Joh. 20. v. 30. *Locus primus. Hæc scripta sunt, &c.* These are written that you may beleeue, that Iesus is Christ the sonne of God: & that in beleeuing yee might haue life through his name. Here the Reader must obserue seriously with me, that this Gospell was written after all other Scriptures of the old and new Testament; euen when the canon of the Scriptures was complet, perfect, and fully accomplished, *viz.* almost an hundred yeares after Christs ascention into heauen, about the fourteenth yeere of the raigne of *Domitianus* then Emperour. Which obseruation being well marked, all the sottish cauils of the Papists will easily be auoyded. Now let vs see, how the auncient Fathers doe vnderstand this place of Scripture.

Cyrillus lib. 12 in Joh. ca. vlt. Saint *Cyrill* hath these words; *Non omnia quæ Dominus fecit, conscripta sunt, sed quæ scribentes tam ad mores quam ad dogmata sufficere putarunt; vt recta fide & operibus ad regnum cœlorum perueniamus.* All things which our Lord did, are not written: but those thinges onely, which the writers deemed sufficient, as well for manners as for doctrine; that by a right faith and good life, we may attaine the Kingdome of heauen.

Aug. in Ioan. tract. 49. tom. 9. in initio. Saint *Austen* hath these words; *Cum multa fecisset dominus, non omnia scripta sunt: electa sunt autem quæ scriberentur, quæ saluti credentium sufficere videbantur.* When our Lord had done many thinges, all were not written: but so much was chosen out to be written, as was thought to be sufficient for the saluation of the faithfull.

Loe, gentle Reader, so much is compriſed in the holy scriptures, as is necessary for our saluation, as well in those things which concerne our life and maners, as in thinges concerning faith and doctrine. Which if the Papists will

graunt

graunt vs, they may keepe their vnwritten traditions vntil Gods people haue neede thereof. For I see not, why they should enforce vs to admit them, except they were necessarie, either for faith, or at the least for good maners: both which notwithstanding, not the scriptures onely, but the fathers also doe denie.

Locus secundus. Non enim subterfugi, quo minus annuntiarem vobis omne consilium Dei. For I haue not spared to shew vnto you, the whole counsell of God. This portion of scripture, is vnderstood of things pertaining to our saluation; as two famous popish writers, *Nicholaus Lyranus*, and *Dyonisius Carthusianus*, do contest with me. *Act. 20. v. 27.*

Carthusianus hath these words; *Sed cum alibi scriptum sit; quis consiliarius eius fuit? sapiens quoq; dixerit; quis homini poterit scire consilium Dei? quomodo potuit* Paulus *omne consilium Dei annuntiare hominibus? & respondendum, quod non simpliciter de omni consilio Dei intendit, sed de omni consilio Dei, quantum ad humanam spectat salutem. Quemadmodū etiam ait saluator; omnia quæ audiui à patre meo, nota feci vobis.* But seeing it is written elsewhere; who hath bin his counseller? and seeing the wise man also saith; what man can know the counsel of God? how could *Paul* shew vnto men, all the counsell of God? answere must be made, that hee meaneth not simply of all the counsell of God; but of all the counsell of God, so farre forth as appertaineth to mans saluation. As our Sauiour also saith; all things which I heard from my father, I haue notified vnto you. *Carthus. in 20. cap. act. apost.* *Rom. 11. 34.* *sap. 9.*

Lyra teacheth the very same doctrine, I omit his words, for the regard I haue to breuitie. By whose iudgement it is most euident, that the whole counsell of God touching our saluation, is contained in the holy Scriptures. And it will not helpe the papists to answere or say, that all the counsell of God was preached, but not written. For first, the Apostle saith, he was called to be an Apostle, seuered into the Gospell of God, which he had promised afore by his Prophets in the holy Scriptures. Secondly, hee auoucheth plainely, that hee taught none other things than those *Lyra in 20. cap. act. apost.* *Rom. 1.*

Act. 26. v. 22. those which the prophets and *Moses* did say should come to passe. Thirdly, *Lyranus* & *Carthusianus*, two renowmed papists, tell vs, that all necessarie doctrine is contained in the precepts of loue. *Carthusianus* hath these words: *Omnia precepta, documenta, & hortamenta legis ac prophetarum, ordinantur ad horum obseruantiam mandatorum, & virtualiter continentur in eis, sicut conclusiones in primis principijs.* All precepts, documents, and exhortations of the law and the prophets, are ordained to the keeping of these commandements, and are virtually contained in them, as conclusions in the first principles.

Carthus. in 22. cap. Matt.

Lyra. in 22. cap. Matt.

Lyranus hath these words: *Propter hoc, omnia mandata legis & monitiones, non sunt nisi quædam explicationes istorum duorum mandatorum. Quia omnia ordinantur ad dilectionem dei & proximi; & similiter doctrina prophetarum ad hoc ordinatur.* For this cause, all the commandements of the law, and all admonitions, are nothing els but certaine explications of these two commaundements. Because all things are ordained to the loue of God and of our neighbour: and in like manner, the doctrine of the prophets is referred to the same end.

Fourthly, the Iesuit *Bellarmine* telleth vs, that the bookes of the Prophets & Apostles are the infallible rules of faith.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 2.

These are his expresse words: *Illud in primis statuendum erit, Propheticos & Apostolicos libros iuxta mentem ecclesiæ Cath. & olim in Conc. 3 Carthag. & nuper in Conc. Trid. explicatam, verum esse verbum dei, & certam ac stabilem regulam fidei.* This must be set downe for a ground and sure foundation, that the bookes of the Prophets and Apostles, according to the minde of the Catholike Church declared aforetime in the third counsell of Carthage, and of late in the counsell of Trent, is the true word of God, and the sure and stable rule of our faith.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 4.

The same Iesuit in another place hath yet more manifest and cleere words, which are these: *Quare cum sacra scriptura regula credendi certissima tutissimaq; sit, sanus professo non erit, qui ea nec lecta spiritus interni sæpe fallacis, & semper*

semper incerti iudicio se commiserit. Wherefore, seeing the holy Scripture is the most certaine and most secure rule of faith, he is not well in his wits doubtlesse, who hauing neglected the same, shall commit himselfe to the iudgement of the internall spirit, which often deceiueth, and neuer is sure or sound.

These words of our Iesuiticall Cardinall (if they bee well marked) will not onely confound himselfe, who elswhere teacheth the contrary doctrine, but also euidently proue the controuersie now in hand. For first, he saith, that the bookes of the Apostles and Prophets rightly expounded, are the infallible rule of faith. Secondly, that the holy Scripture is the most safe and most secure rule how to beleeue. Thirdly, that hee is mad, whosoeuer will giue credit to the inward spirit, and not stay himselfe vpon the written word. All which doubtlesse confound him and his Iesuiticall broode; as who will not relye vpon the written testimonies of Gods truth, but seeke after vnwritten falshoods and vanities, and ground their faith vpon the same.

Fiftly, S. *Austen* teacheth the selfe same truth, when hee telleth vs flatly, that nothing is contained in the Gospell and Epistles of the Apostles, which is not also compriſed in the law and the Prophets. These are his expresse words: *In eo tanta predicatio & prenuntiatio noui Testamenti est, vt nulla in euangelica atq; Apostolica disciplina reperiantur, quãuis ardua & diuina præcepta & promissa, quæ illis etiam libris veteribus desint.* In the old testament, the new testament is so largely preached and foreshewed, that nothing can bee found in the discipline or doctrine of the Gospell and of the Apostles, although they be hard and diuine precepts and promises, which are wanting in those old bookes. This being, it followeth of necessitie, that all things needefull to saluation, are contained in the Scriptures. For S. *Paul* preached all the counsell of God; S. *Paules* preachings are contained in the doctrine of the Prophets; the doctrine of the Prophets is contained in the Law; the Law was writ-

Aug. contra Adimant. ca. 3 tom. 6. pa. 121.

ten with the finger of God; *Ergo à primo ad vltimum*, all things necessarie for our saluation, are contained in the written word of God.

Locus tertius. Because from thine infancie thou hast knowne the holy Scriptures, τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρ-
2. Tim. 3. v. 15 *ιαν*. Which are able to make thee wise vnto saluation, through faith which is in Christ Iesus. Thus saith S. *Paul*. But doubtlesse, if so much be written as is able to make vs wise to saluation; we stand in need of no more, it is enough. Let the Papists keepe their vnwritten traditions to themselues, let vs relye vpon the written truth. Let vs be wise vnto saluation, contenting our selues with that which it pleased God to reueale in his written word, and let them be presumptuous and curious to follow mans inuentions, and to beleeue vnwritten vanities.

The second reason, drawne from the authoritie of the holy Fathers.

De diuinis nominib. cap. 1. in initio.

Dionysius Areopagita, who liued in the dayes of the Apostles, doth liuely deliuer this truth vnto vs in these expresse words: *Omnino igitur non audiendum est, quicquam de summa absq; diuinitate aut dicere aut cogitare præter ea quæ nobis diuinitus scripturæ diuinæ enuntiarunt.* In no wise therefore may we make bold to speake or thinke any thing of the most high and ineffable diuinitie, saue that onely which holy writ hath reuealed to vs from heauen.

S. *Augustine*, that glistering beame and strong pillar of Christs Church, auoucheth plainely, that all things necessarie for our saluation, are contained in the written word, as is already prooued in the former reason: and he confirmeth the same doctrine in another place, where he hath these expresse words: *In his enim quæ apertè in scriptura posita sunt, inueniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem, moresq; viuendi; spem scilicet atq; charitatem.* For in these things which are plainly set downe in the holy scripture, all things are found which containe faith, and manners, that is to say, hope and charitie.

Aug. de doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 6. & ca 9. tom. 3.

The

The ſame S. *Auſten* in another place hath theſe expreſſe words: *Credo quod etiam hinc diuinorum eloquiorum clariſſima authoritas eſſet, ſi homo ſine diſpendio promiſſæ ſalutis illud ignorare non poſſet.* I beleeue, that euen in this point alſo we ſhould haue moſt cleere teſtimonie of holy writ, if a man could not be ignorant thereof, without the loſſe of his ſaluation. *Aug. de pecca. merit. & remiſſ. lib. 2. cap. vlt. tom. 7.*

S. *Iræneus* hath theſe words: *Non enim per alios diſpoſitionem ſalutis noſtræ cognouimus, quam per eos, per quos euangelium peruenit ad nos: quod quidem tunc preconiauerunt, poſtea vero per dei voluntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum.* For wee know the diſpenſation of our ſaluation, by them onely, by whom the Goſpell came to our hands: which Goſpell they firſt preached, but afterward by Gods appointment they deliuered the ſame vnto vs in writing, that it might bee the foundation and pillar of our faith. *Iræne. li 3. ca. 1*

Tertullianus an ancient writer, (who liued aboue 1300. yeares agoe) hath theſe expreſſe words: *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, quæ mihi & factorem manifeſtat, & facta. An autem ex aliqua ſubiacenti materia facta ſint omnia, nuſquam adhuc legi. Scriptum eſſe doceat* Hermogenis *officina. Si non eſt ſcriptum, timeat væ illud adijcientibus aut detrahentibus deſtinatum.* I reuerence the plenitude, fulneſſe, and perfection of the Scripture, as which ſheweth to me, both the maker, and the things which are made. But that all things are made of ſome ſubiacent matter, I neuer could yet read any where. Let *Hermogenes* his ſhop ſhew vs, where it is written. If it be no where wtrtten, let him be afraid of that woe which is prouided for them that adde or take away from the Scripture. *Tertul. contra Hermogen. pa. 373.*

Loe (gentle Reader) theſe three moſt ancient Fathers doe teach vs many very excellent documents. Firſt, that wee know the diſpotion of our ſaluation by Chriſts Apoſtles. Secondly, that wee receiued the Goſpell from them. Thirdly, that they firſt preached the myſteries of our ſaluation, deliuering the Goſpell by word of mouth.

Fourthly, that afterward they committed the same to writing. Fiftly, that the Scripture was written by Gods owne appoyntment. Sixtly, that it was written for this end and purpose, That it might be the pillar and foundation of our faith. Seuenthly, that wee may not speake or thinke any thing of God, which wee finde not written in Gods Booke. Eightly, that the holy Scripture is perfect, and containeth all things necessarie for vs to know. Ninthly, that all such as teach or beleeue any doctrine not contained in the Scriptures, must drink of the cup of eternall woe for their paines. Let vs proceed and see, what other Fathers of later times tell vs.

Cypryan ep. 74 ad Pompeium cont. ep Steph. col. 229.

S. Cyprian (who liued about 249. yeares after Christ, *viz.* aboue 1300. yeares agoe) hath these words: *Unde ista traditio? Utrumne de dominica & euangelica authoritate descendens? an de Apostolorum mandatis & Epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse qua scripta sunt, Deus testatur, & proponit ad Iesum Naue dicens; Non recedet liber Legis huius ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, vt observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt in eo. Si ergo aut Euangelio præciputur, aut in Apostolorum epistolis, aut actibus continetur, obseruetur diuina hæc & sancta traditio.* From whence came this tradition? Did it descend from the authoritie of our Lord, or his gospell? Or came it from the mandates of the Apostles, or their Epistles? For, that those things must be done which are written, God himselfe doth witnesse, and propose to Iesus Naue, saying: The Book of this law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein night and day, that thou maiest obserue to doe all things which are written in it. If therefore it be eyther commanded in the gospell, or be contained in the epistles, or in the Acts of the Apostles, let this diuine and holy tradition be obserued.

Thus writeth S. *Ciprian*, shewing plainely, that all traditions ought to bee examined by the written word, and nothing to bee admitted, which is not contained in the same, or grounded thereupon. Where I note by the way, for the helpe of the Reader, that though *Cornelius* then

then Bishop of Rome (whome now the Papists tearme Pope and his holinesse) together with the whole nationall synode of all the Bishops of Italie, had made a flat decree touching rebaptization: and though also Pope *Stephanus* his holynesse had confirmed the same decree, and commaunded it to be obserued: and thirdly, though our Papists of late daies doe obstinately affirme, that their Pope cannot erre when hee defineth iudicallie. Yet this notwithstanding. S *Cyprian* teacheth and telleth vs plainly and roundly, that in his time the Bishop of Rome had no such authority, as this day hee proudly and antichristianly taketh vppon him: for hee roundly withstood the decree of Pope *Stephanus*, who then was Bishop of Rome, and both sharpely reprooued him, and contemned his falsely pretended authoritie. And for all that, S. *Cyprian* was euer reputed an holy Bishop in his life time, and a glorious martyr being dead. But if the Bishop of Rome had been Christs Vicar, and so priuiledged, as our Papists beare the world in hand he is, then doubtlesse S. *Cyprian* must needs haue beene an hertícke, and so reputed and esteemed in the Church of God. For, if any Christian shall this day do or affirme as S. *Cyprian* did, or publickely deny the Popes falsely pretended prymacy in any place, Countrey, territories, or dominions, where popery beareth the sway, then without all peraduenture, he must be burnt at a stake, with fire and faggot for his paines.

Euſ. lib. 7. hiſt. cap. 2, 3. 4.

S. *Athanasius* hath these words: *Sufficiunt sanctæ ac diuinitus inspiratæ scripturæ, ad veritatis inditionem.* The holy scriptures inspired of God, are sufficient for the discussion and manifestation of truth. Where the Reader must obserue with me, that *Athanasius* contending against the gentiles, that their Idols were not Gods; and prooving that Christ was true God and true man by the Scriptures; and withall auouching that the Scriptures were sufficient to decide and determine the controuersie; should haue made a verie fooliſh argument, and haue concluded nothing at all, if any necessarie truth had been wanting, and not fully con-

Athan. contra gẽtes seu idola

tained in the holy Scriptures.

Epiph.hær,65. S. *Epiphanius* hath these words: *Nos vnusquiusq; quæstionis inuentionem, non ex prorpijs ratiocinationibus dicere possumus, sed ex scripturarum consequentia.* We cannot shew the inuention of euery question out of our own proper reasons, but by consequence of the Scriptures.

Cyrillus li.2.de recta fide ad regin.tom.2. S. *Cyrill* hath these words: *Necessarium nobis est diuinas sequi literas, & in nullo ab earum prescripto discedere.* It is necessary for vs to follow the holy Scriptures, and not in the least iot to depart from the prescript rule thereof.

Chrys. in Psa. 95.to.1. prope finem. S. *Chrysostome* hath these words: *Si quid dicatur absq; scriptura, auditorũ cogitatio claudicat, nunc annuens, nunc hæsitans, & interdum sermonem vt friuolum aduersans, interdum vt probabilem recipiens. Verum vbi è scriptura diuinæ vocis prodijt testimonium, & loquentis sermonem, & audientis animum confirmat.* If any thing bee spoken without the scripture, the cogitation of the auditors fayleth, sometime yeelding, sometime staggering, and sometime reiecting the speech as friuolous, sometime receiuing it as probable. But so soone as the testimonie of Gods voyce is heard out of the scripture, it confirmeth both the word of the speaker, and the mind of the hearer.

Chrysost.ho.41 in Mat.22. in opere imperf. The same S. *Chrysostome* in another place hath these words: *Quicquid quæritur ad salutem, totum iam ad impletum est in scripturis.* Loe, these holy fathers and ancient writers (who all of them liued aboue a thousand and one hundred yeares agoe) teach the selfesame doctrine with the former fathers. They tel vs first, that the holy scripture is sufficient to decide all controuersies. Secondly, that we must affirme or hold no doctrine, but that which we find in the scriptures. Thirdly, that wee must not in the least point of doctrine, depart or swarue from the rule of holy scripture. Fourthly, that in the holy scripture is fully compriſed whatsoeuer is necessary for mans saluation. But let vs yet heare the verdict of some others.

Ambr.de fide ad Grat.lib.1. cap.4.tom.2. S. *Ambr.* hath these words: *Non negamus, imò potius horremus hanc vocem. Sed nolo argumẽto credas sancte imperator, &*

nostra

noſtræ diſputationi. Scripturas interrogemus; interrogemus Apoſtolos; interrogemus Prophetas; interrogemus Chriſtum. We denie not, but rather abhorre the word. Yet, holy Emperour, I would neither haue you beleeue our argument, nor our diſputation. Let vs aske counſell vpon the Scriptures; let vs aske the Apoſtles; let vs aske the Prophets; let vs aske Chriſt himſelfe, and ſo let vs know what is the truth.

S. *Baſill* hath theſe words: *Si quicquid ex fide non eſt, peccatum eſt, ſicut dicit Apoſtolus; fides vero ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Dei; ergo quiquid extra diuinam ſcripturam eſt, cum ex fide non ſit, peccatum eſt.* If whatſoeuer is not of faith, bē ſinne, as the Apoſtle ſaith; and if alſo faith come by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; then doubtleſſe, whatſoeuer is not in the holy ſcripture, the ſame is ſin, becauſe it is not of faith. *Baſilius. in ethicis definit. vlt. prope finem.*

The ſame S. *Baſill* in another place hath theſe wordes: *Stemus arbitratu inſpiratæ à Deo ſcripturæ; & apud quos inueniuntur dogmata diuinis oraculis conſona, illis omnino veritatis adiudicetur ſententia.* Let vs be iudged by the Scripture, which came from God by inſpiration; and whoſe doctrine ſhall be found conſonant to Gods Oracles, let the truth bee iudged to be on their ſide. *Baſil. ad Euſtath. medicum epiſt. 80.*

S. *Hierome* hath theſe words: *Hoc quia de ſcripturis non habet authoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur.* This opinion is as eaſily reiected as it is affirmed, becauſe it hath no authoritie from the Scriptures. *Hier in ca. 23 Matth. Vide Paul. Burgenſ. in 1. cap. Oſee.*

The ſame S. *Hierome* in another place hath theſe words: *Quomodo narrabit? non verbo, ſed ſcriptura. Videte quid dicat qui fuerunt, non qui ſunt: vt exceptis Apoſtolis quodcunq; aliud poſtea dicatur, abſcindatur, non habeat poſtea authoritatem. Quamuis ergo ſanctus ſit aliquis poſt Apoſtolos, quamuis diſertus ſit, non habeat authoritatem. Quoniam dominus narrat in ſcriptura populorū, & principum horum qui fuerunt in ea.* How ſhal he ſhew it? not by word, but by the holy ſcripture. Mark what he ſaith, who were, but not who are; to the end, that the Apoſtles being excepted, whatſoeuer other thing be afterward ſpokē, it muſt be reiected, it muſt haue no authority *Hier. in Pſal. 86.*

at

at all. Wherefore, though a man be holy, though he be learned, yet ſeeing hee commeth after the Apoſtles, let him be of no authoritie. For our Lord ſpeaketh to vs in the ſcripture of his people, and of the princes that were therein.

Hier. in Jere. cap. 9. tom. 5. The ſame Saint *Hierome* in another place hath theſe words: *Ergo nec parentum, nec maiorum error ſequendus eſt, ſed authoritas ſcripturarum, & Dei docentis imperium.* Therefore wee muſt neither follow the errour of our parents, nor of our aunceſtours, but the authoritie of the ſcriptures, and the commandement of God teaching vs.

The third reaſon, drawne from the authoritie of famous popiſh writers.

Roffenſis art. 37. adu. Luth. pag. 411. *Iohn* Fryer the late Biſhop of Rocheſter, one highly renowmed amongſt the Papiſts, and with them canonized for a Saint and glorious Martyr, ſo as his authoritie muſt perforce bee of credit againſt them, hath theſe expreſſe words: *Scriptura ſacra conclaue quoddam eſt omnium veritatum, quæ Chriſtianis ſcitu neceſſariæ ſunt.* The holy ſcripture is a certaine ſtore-houſe of all truths, which are needefull to be knowne of Chriſtians.

Roffenſ. adu. art. Luther. verit. 4. In another place the ſame famous Papiſt hath theſe words: *Contendentibus atq; nobiſcum hæreticis, nos alio ſubſidio noſtrã oportet tueri cauſam, quam Scripturæ ſacræ.* Therfore when heretiques contend with vs, we muſt defend our cauſe by other meanes, than by the holy ſcripture. Theſe are the very expreſſe words of their owne famous Popiſh Biſhop, of their holy Saint, of their glorious Martyr; who laboured with might and maine for the Popes vſurped ſoueraignetie, and defended the ſame in the beſt manner he was able. And yet for all that, hee hath bolted out vnawares and againſt his will (ſuch is the force of truth, which muſt needes in time preuaile) ſo much in plaine tearmes, as is ſufficient to ouerthrow all Popery for euer, and to cauſe all people that haue any care of their ſaluation, to renounce the Pope and his abhominable doctrine to their liues end. For firſt, our Popiſh Biſhop telleth vs plainely,

plainely, and withiout all dissimulation, (his mouth being now opened by him that caused *Balaams* asse to speake) That in the holy scripture, as in a plentifull store-house, is laid vp for vs and our instruction, all knowledge necessarie for mans saluation. Againe, the same popish bishop, Saint, and Martyr, (of papists so esteemed and reputed) telleth vs roundly, That they must not (because forsooth they cannot) defend and maintaine their poperie by the authority of the scripture, but by some other waye and meanes, to wit, by mans inuentions and popish vnwritten vanities, which they tearme the Churches traditions. Now gentle reader, how can any papist (who is not giuen vp in *reprobum sensum* for his iust deserts) read such testimonies against poperie, freely confessed and published to the world by papists, euen when they bestirre themselues busily to maintaine their Pope and his popish doctrine; and for all that continue papists still, and bee carried away headlong into perdition; beleeuing and obeying that doctrine which cannot bee defended by the written word of God, which is the store-house of all necessary knowledge? They doubtlesse are either very senceleſse, or so blinded for their former sinnes, that they cannot behold the sunne shinning at noone tide: me thinks they should bee ashamed to hold and beleeue that doctrine; in defence whereof, they can yeeld no better reasons. But let vs yet heare what other renowned popish writers tell vs; who doubtlesse will not bewray their owne cause, but against their wils. Howbeit as the wise man saith, *Magna est veritas, & prævalet*; The truth is of such force as it must needs preuaile, and in time haue the vpper hand.

Numer. ca. 22 v. 28.

Rom. 1. v. 24.

2. Thes. 2. v. 12
Rom. 1. v. 24.

3. Esdr. 4. v. 42

- *Melchior Canus* another popish bishop, and a very learned schoole-doctor, hath these expresse words; *Cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibiq; ad omnia satis superq; sufficiat; quid opus est, vt ei sanctorum & intelligentia iungatur, & authoritas?* Seeing the canon of the scripture is perfect, and most sufficient of it selfe to euery end, and in euery respect;

Melch. Canus de locis theol. lib. 7. cap. 3.

what need haue wee to ioyne therewith, either the exposition or the authority of the fathers. Thus writeth this great learned papist, not denying the sufficiencie of the holy scripture, but requiring the commentaries of the fathers, for the better vnderstanding of the same. Whose opinion I do approue and commend in that respect, as is euident to all that shall peruse my booke of Motiues.

Aquinas, p. 1. q. 36. art. 2. ad primum.

Thomas Aquinas, (whome the Pope hath canonized for a Saint, and his doctrine for authenticall) teacheth vs not to beleeue any thing concerning God, sauing that onely which is contained in the scripture expresly, or at least significantly. These are his own words: *Dicendum, quod de Deo dicere non debemus, quod in sacra scriptura non inuenitur, vel per verba, vel per sensum.* We must answete, that nothing is to be verified of God, which is not contained in holy writ, either expresly, or in sence.

Aquinas, p. 3. q. 42. art. 4. ad primum.

The same popish doctour in an other place hath these words: *Quicquid enim ille (Christus) de suis factis & dictis nos legere voluit, hoc scribendum illis tanquam suis manibus imperauit.* For whatsoeuer Christ would haue vs to read of his doings and sayings, the same he commaunded his Apostles to write, as if he had done it with his owne hands. Loe, in these woords *Aquinas* auoucheth very plainely, that all things necessary for our saluation, are contained in the scriptures. For in Christs deeds, are contained his myracles, his life, his conuersation: in his sayings semblably, are contayned his preaching, his teaching, his doctrine, and consequently, whatsoeuer is necessary for vs to knowe. If then this be true, as it is most true, (for the papists neither will, nor can deny the doctrine of *Aquinas*) that whatsoeuer Christ would haue vs to know, of his miracels, of his life, of his conuersation, of his preaching, of his teaching, of his doctrine, the same is now written in the scriptures: no man doubtlesse, but he that will *cum ratione insanire*, can deny all things necessary for our saluation, to be contained in the holy scripture.

See the Iesuit *Bellarmines* doctrine, in the end of the second exposition, and note it well.

To this doctrine deliuered by *Aquinas*, agreeth their owne

owne renowmed Professor, and most learned Schoole-doctor *Franciscus a victoria*, that Spanish fryer. His expresse words are these; *Non est mihi certum, licet omnes dicant, quod in scriptura non continetur.* I doe not thinke it certaine and sure, although all writers affirme it, which is not contained in the scripture. *Vict. de sacra. pa. 120,*

The same Popish Doctor and Fryer in another place hath these words: *Propter quas (opiniones) nullo modo debemus, discedere à regula & sinceritate scripturarum.* For which opinions we must by no meanes depart from the rule and sincerite of the holy scriptures. Loe (gentle Reader) our popish Fryer will beleeue no doctrine, which is not contained in the scripture; although all writers teach the same, Mad men therefore may they be deemed, that will beleeue whatsoeuer the Pope telleth them, though it be neuer so repugnant to the scripture. *Anselmus* and *Lyra* two other famous popish writers, doe teach vs the selfe same doctrine. *Victor. relect. 8. de augmen. charit. p. 308.* *Vide in Ansel. in 2. tim. cap. 3 & Liran. in mat. 19.*

The second Proposition.

All persons of what sexe, state, calling, or condition soeuer they be, may lawfully, and ought seriously to read the holy scriptures; as out of which, euen the simplest of al may gather so much as is necessary for their saluation. This I say, against that popish, ridiculous, vnchristian, and very pestilent abuse, where the Pope deliuereth to the people, as it were by way of Apostolicall tradition, the Scriptures, Sacraments, and Church-seruice, in a strange tongue to them vnknowne. Which to be flatly against the practise of the primitiue Church, I haue prooued copiously in my Booke of Suruey. Here therefore I will onely shew, that it is both lawfull and neccessarie for all sorts of people that desire to attaine eternall life, to read diligently the holy Scriptures.

S. *Chrisostome* discourseth at large of this subiect in many places of his workes; but I will content my selfe with some few for the present. In his commentaries vpon S. *Paul* he hath these words: *Et vos itaq; si lectioni cum animi alacritate volueritis attendere, nullo alio præterea opus habebitis.* *Chriso. in proæmio epist. ad Rom.*

Verus enim est sermo Christi, cum dicit; querite & inuenietis, pulsate & aperietur. Verum quia plures ex ijs, qui huc cõuenere, & liberorum educationem, & vxoris curam, gubernandaq; domus in sese receperunt, atq; ideo non sustinent totos se labori isti addicere, saltem ad percipienda quæ alij colligerunt, exitamini: tantum ijs quæ dicuntur audiendis impendite diligentiæ quantũ colligendis pecunijs. Tametsi enim turpe sit non nisi tantum à vobis exigere, tamen contentierimus, si vel tantum prestetis. Nã hinc innumera mala nata sunt, quod scripturæ ignorantur. Hinc eripuit multa illa hæreseon pernicies; hinc vita dissoluta, hinc inutiles labores: quemadmodum enim qui luce ista priuati sunt, recta vtiq; non pergunt: ita qui ad radios diuinarum scripturarum non respiciunt, multa coguntur continuò delinquere, vtpote in longe peioribus tenebris ambulantes; quod ne nobis vsu veniat, oculos ad spendorem apostolicorum verborum aperiamus.

If therefore you will reade the Scriptures with alacritie of minde, you shall need no other helpe at all. For Christs word is true, when he saith: Seeke and ye shall finde; knock, and it shall be opened vnto you. But because many of you are charged with Wiues, Children, and domesticall regiment, and so cannot wholly addict your selues to this studie: yet at the last bee readie to heare what others haue gathered, and bestow so much diligence in hearing what is said, as you doe in scraping worldly goods together. For, albeit it bee a shame to require no more of you, yet will I bee content, if yee doe so much. For the cause of infinite euils, is your ignorance in the Scriptures: From hence springeth the manifold mischiefe of heresies; from hence dissolute life; from hence vaine and vnprofitable labours. For euen as they that are bereaued of this light, cannot goe the right way: so they that doe not behold the beames of the holy scriptures, are enforced incontinently to offend in many things, as walking in farre greater darkenesse.

This is the golden censure of Saint *Chrysostome*, rightly surnamed the golden mouthed Doctor. Out of whose doctrine, I gather these worthy obseruations: First, that who-

whosoeuer studyeth in the Scriptures seriously, and with alacritie, shall find therein, and vnderstand so much, as is necessarie for his saluation. And consequently, that our disholy Father the Pope, debarreth vs of the ordinary meanes of our saluation; when he vpon paine of excommunication, inhibiteth vs to read the Scriptures in our vulgar tongue, vnlesse wee haue his licence and dispensation so to doe. And hee hath I confesse, some reason thus to deale, because forsooth Poperie would haue a short raigne, if euery Papist might freely reade the holy Scripture, and other godly Bookes written for their instruction. But alasse, they are so bewitched with his blessings, that they thinke they shall bee damned, if they doe but reade this my discourse, or any other opposite to Poperie, not hauing his license so to doe. But all his priests are licenced; and so they can pretend no excuse, if they doe not frame some answer hereunto.

Secondly, that it is a very shame, for men charged with wiues, children, and family; that they doe but onely heare Sermons, and doe not withall study the holy Scriptures; and consequently, that it is much more shame for others that be more free, not to read them diligently; and greatest shame of all for a Bishop, to approue or commend them that will so doe.

Thirdly, that heresies, dissolute life, and all other euils, doe proceede of ignorance, and of not reading the holy Scriptures.

The same S. *Chrisost.* in another place hath these words: *Propterea obsecro, vt subinde huc veniatis, & diuina scripturæ lectionem diligenter auscultetis; nec solum cum huc venitis, sed & domi diuinas biblias in manus sumite, & vtilitatẽ in illis positam magno studio suscipite. Sequitur paulò inferius; Tantum igitur lucrum oro, ne per negligentiam amittemus, sed & domi vacemus diuinarum scripturarum lectioni, & hic presentes non in nugis & inutilibus colloquijs tempus decoquamus.* I beseech you therefore, that your will come hither now and then, and *Chrisost. in. 9. cap. genes. hom. 29. tom. 1.*

attend diligently the reading of the holy scriptures: neither that onely when ye come hither, but at home also take the holy Bibles into your hands, and with great study embrace the profit contained in them. I pray you therefore, let vs not negligently loose so great gaine, but when wee are at home, let vs then apply our selues to reade the holy Scriptures: and being here, let vs not spend our time idlely and vainely.

By these testimonies, (to omit many others) wee may perceiue most euidently, how grieuously Saint *Chrisostome* lamenteth, that the people in his time were so negligent in reading the holy Scripture. What therefore would that holy Father say, if he liued in these our dayes, in which the Pope burneth such scriptures, as the people vnderstand in their vulgar tongue: In which hee commaundeth all Church-seruice to be in straunge and vnknowne language: In which he excommunicateth all Lay-persons be they neuer so well learned, that reason of matter of faith, or dispute of his power? What would he say, if hee heard Priests pronounce absolution in their popish Sacrament of penance, which neyther the penitents, nor the priests themselues doe often vnderstand? Nay, what would hee say, if he were this day in popish Churches, where they doe not onely reade ther Church-seruice in Latine, but also Latine Homilies or Sermons vnto the vulgar sort; which yet they tearme an exposition of the Scripture: which manner of proceeding is practised euery festiuall day of nine lessons in the time of their mattens? In fine, what would hee say, if hee knew the rude vulgar sort, who are commaunded to heare the Gospell read in Latine, and withall should see them listening with their eares, least any word should not be heard, though impossible of them to bee dnderstoode? would he not, and might he not iustly say with the holy Apostle, that they were mad? Yes doubtlesse, it cannot be denyed.

6. decret. lib. 5. cap. quicunque.

1. Cor. 14. v. 24.

Origen, who liued aboue a thousand and three hundred yeares

yeares agoe, doth not onely exhort the people seriously to reade the scriptures, but withall sheweth plainely, that in his time they were read in the vulgar tongue. These are his words: *Certè, si non omnia possumus, saltem ea quæ nunc docentur in Ecclesia, vel quæ recitantur, memoriæ commendemus.* Doubtlesse, if wee cannot beare away all things contained in the Scriptures, yet at the least let vs remember those things which are taught and read in the Church. Loe, in these golden words he speaketh not onely of Sermons, but also of the Gospels, Epistles, Prayers, Lessons, and histo-ryes of the Bible. For Sermons are contained in the word (*docentur*, which are preached; and the rest in the word (*recitantur*, which are read or rehearsed;) but certes, if such things had beene read in a strange and vnknowne tongue, the vulgar sort could not haue committed them to memorie. And consequently, to no end or purpose should *Origen* haue made this exhortation. And the obiection which is common in the mouthes of our Papists, That Saint *Peter* affirmeth the Scriptures to be obscure and hard to bee vnderstood (notwithstanding the great brags, and insolent vaunts of our Rhemists) is too too foolish, and of no force at all. For first, Saint *Peter* saith not, that the whole scripture is hard to bee vnderstood, but some things in S. *Paules* Epistles. Secondly, hee speaketh not solely and barely of the vnlearned, but of the vnlearned which are vnstable. Thirdly, hee speaketh not generally of all readers of the Scripture, but of those wicked ones, which depraue not onely Saint *Paules* Epistles, but also all other Scriptures, to their owne perdition. Howbeit, to debarre all the godly, who with all humilitie and reuerence desire to reade the Scriptures; and to abandon one onely particular euill, by taking away the good wholly and generally, may well bee resembled to those vnskilfull Physitions, who cannot deliuer their patients from any particular disease, except they take away their liues. But wise *Salomon* was of another minde, when hee affirmed all the words

Origen hom. 4. de super leuit. per finem.

Rhemist. in 2. Pet. cap. 3.

Vide D. Chrysost. in præmio epist. ad Rom. initio.

Prou. 8, v. 8, 9.

words of wisedome to be open and easie to euery one of vnderstanding, that is, which haue a desire to the truth, and are not blinded of the Prince of this world. For, as by the foole, hee meaneth euery wicked man: so by a man of vnderstanding, he meaneth euery one that is Godly. Here-
Psal. 25. *v.* 9 vpon it is saide, that God reuealeth his secret counsels
Iohn. 7. *v.* 17. to all that feare him: That whosoeuer will doe the will of
John. 8. *v.* 31. God, the same shall know his doctrine: That they which
32. abide in Gods word, shall know the truth: That God re-
Mat. 11. *v.* 25. uealeth his will vnto the simple and vnlearned ones, and
Psal. 119. hideth his secrets from the wise and prudent: That the
v. 105. whole body of the Scripture, from the head to the foote thereof, is tearmed a lanterne to our feet, and a light vnto our pathes: That Gods word is like a candle shining in a darke place, vntill the day dawne, and the day-starre arise
2. *Pet.* 1. *v.* 19. in our hearts: That the spirituall man doth vnderstand all
1. *Cor.* 2. *v.* 15. things which are necessarie for his saluation: for so *Lyra* and *Dionysius Carthusianus*, two great learned Papists, doe expound the place. And consequently, if Gods word bee hidden to any, it is hidnen to those that perish, to those
2. *Cor.* 4. *v.* 3. 4 whose vnderstandings the God of this world hath blinded, that the light of the Gospell of the glory of Christ, should not shine vnto them.

Chrisin S. *Chrysostome* hath these golden words: *Quid opus est*
2. *Thes.* cap. 2. *concionatore? Per nostram negligentiam necessitas ista facta est.*
hom. 3. *Quamobrē namq; concione opus est? Omnia clara sunt & plana ex diuinis scripturis; quæcunq; necessaria sunt, manifesta sunt.* What neede is there of a Preacher? Our negligence hath caused this necessitie. For to what end is a sermon needfull? All things are cleere acd euident in the holy Scriptures, what things soeuer are necessary, the same are manifest.

Chri. in Coloss. The same S. *Chrisostome*, in his Commentaries vpon the
ho. 9. *col.* 1290 Epistle to the Colossians hath these words: *Audite quotquot estis mundani, & vxoribus præestis ac liberis, quomodo & vobis potissimum precipiat scripturas legere, idq; non simpliciter neq; obiter, sed magna diligentia. Sequitur paulo, inferius; Audite*

dite obsecro seculares omnes. Comparate vobis Biblias, animæ pharmaca. Si nihil aliud vultis, vel nouum testamentum acquirite, Apostolum, Acta, Euangelia, continuos ac sedulos doctores. Si acciderit mæstitia, huc veluti Apothecam pharmacorum introspice. Hinc tibi sume solamen mali, siue damnum euenerit, siue mors, siue amissio domesticorum. Imò non introspice solum, sed omnia iterum asq; iterum versa, menteq; illa contine. Hoc demum malorum omnium causa est, quod scripturæ ignorantur. Iterum, doce puerum tuum Psalmos illos canere Philosophiæ plenos. Hearken all ye that are encombred with worldly affaires, and haue charge of Wiues, and Children, how you specially are commaunded to reade the scriptures, and that not simply, nor slenderly, but with great diligence. Heare I pray you, all secular persons. Prouide and furnish your selues with Bibles, the soueraigne medicines of your soules. If you wil haue no other thing, at the least prouide the new Testament, the Apostle, the Acts, the Gospell, the continuall and diligent doctors. If any griefe come, turne thine eye vnto the scripture, as to the Apothecaries shop ful of medicines. From hence receiue sollace of euill, whether domage, or death, or losse of worldly goods chance vnto thee. Yea, looke not onely to the scripture, but volue and reuolue all things contained therein, and keepe the same in minde. For this is the cause of al manner of euils, that men are ignorant in the holy scriptures. Teach your Children to sing Psalmes which are full of Philosophie.

Thus writeth this holy Father, teaching vs at large, how necessary and needefull a thing it is for euery one to studie and reade diligently the holy scriptures. For first, he telleth vs plainely, that all necessary points of doctrine are so plaine and manifest, as one may vnderstand the same without the Preacher. Secondly, that they who are charged with wiues, children, and worldly affaires, are specially and more then others, commaunded to reade the Scriptures: The reason hereof hee yeeldeth in another place; because the more they are encombred with the

cares of the world, the more neede they haue to enioy the helpes of the holy scripture. These are his words: *Quid ais homo? Non est tui negotij scripturas euolnere, quoniam in numeris curis distraheris? Imò tuum magis est, quam illorum. Neq; enim illi perinde scripturarum egent presidio, at q; vos in medijs negotiorum vndis iactati.* What sayest thou O man? Is it not thy part and dutie to reade the holy scriptures, because thou art encombred with many worldly cares? yea, it is so much more thy charge than it is theirs: For they haue not so great neede of the helpe of the Scriptures as you haue, who are tossed in the middest of the waues of worldly troubles. Thirdly, that all secular persons of both sexes, must furnish thēselues with the holy Bible. Fourthly, that they must not onely reade the scriptures barely and slenderly, but that they must doe the same with great diligence. Fiftly, that the Scriptures doe minister comforts for all sorrowes, and soueraigne medicines for all sores. Sixtly, that the ignorance of the scriptures is the cause of all euils. Seuenthly, that Parents must teach their Children to sing Psalmes, yea, euen those Psalmes which are replenished with Philosophie.

Chrys. cont. 3. de lazaro. to. 2. col. 1340

Aug. de doctr. Chr. li. 2. ca. 9.

S. *Austen* teacheth in the same manner, that all things necessary for mans saluation, are plaine and easie to be vnderstood. These are his expresse words: *In his enim quæ apertè in scriptura posita sunt, inueniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem morcs q; viuendi.* For in those things which are plainely set downe in the holy scripture, are found all things concerning faith and manners.

Aug. de doctr. Chr. li. 2. ca. 6.

The same S. *Austen* in another place hath these words: *Magnifice igitur & salubriter spiritus sanctus ita scripturas sanctas mollificauit, vt locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret.* God hath so tempered the holy scriptures, that by manifold places he might prouide against famine, and by those which are more obscure, hee might cleanse the loathsomnesse of our stomacks. And his reason hereof followeth in these next words: *Nihil enim fere*

ferè de illis obscuritatibus eruitur, quod nõ planissimè dictũ alibi reperiatur, For almost nothing is contained in obscure places, which is not most paynly vttered in some other place.

The same father in another place hath these words; *Nec solum vobis sufficiat, quod in ecclesia diuinas lectiones auditis; sed etiam in domibus vestris aut ipsi legite, aut alios legentes requirite, & libenter audite.* Let it not be ynough for you onely to heare Gods word in the Church; but also reade it your selues in your houses, or else procure others to reade it, and heare you them willingly. *Aug. de tempore serm. 55.*

Out of these woordes of this holy writer, and antient father, wee may learne many godly lessons. First, that all things needfull for our saluation, are plainely set downe in the scriptures. Secondly, that things which are obscurely touched in some places, are plainely handled in other places. Thirdly, that the scriptures are obscure in some places, to exercise our wits, and to cleanse the loathsomnesse of our stomackes. Fourthly, that we must reade the scriptures at home in our houses, & not heare them read in the churches. Fiftly, that if we cannot reade them our selues, then must we procure others to reade them to vs, and marke diligently what they reade, and heare them with desire and alacrity of mind.

Saint *Hierome* is consonant to Saint *Austen* and Saint *Chrysostome*, affirming, that in his time (which was about 1200 yeeres agoe) both Monkes, men, and women, did contend who could learne moe scriptures without booke. These are his expresse words; *Solent & viri, solent & monachi, solent & mulierculæ hoc inter se habere certamen, vt plures ediscant scripturas; & in eo se putant esse meliores, si plures edidicerint.* Men, women, and Monkes, vse to contend one with another, who can learne moe scriptures: and herein they thinke themselues better, if they can learne more. *Hieron. in Psal. 133.*

The same Saint *Hierome* in an other place, speaking of the education of a yoong maide of seuen yeeres old, hath

Hier. ad Gaudentium, tom. 1. fol. 44. B.

theſe words: *Matris nutum, pro verbis ac monitis, & pro imperio habeat. Amet vt parentem, ſubijciatur vt dominæ, timeat vt magiſtram. Cum autem virgunculam rudem & edentulã ſeptimus ætatis annus exceperit, & cæperit erubeſcere, ſcire quid taceat, dubitare quid dicat: diſcat memoriter pſalterium: & vſq; ad annos pubertatis libros Salomonis, euanglia, Apoſtolos, & prophetas, ſui cordis theſaurum faciat.* Let her mothers beck to her, be in ſtead of words, admonitions, and commaunds. Let her loue her as her parent, obey her as her Lady, and feare her as her miſtris. And when the rude and toothleſſe girle ſhall be ſeauen yeare old, and ſhal begin to be baſhful, to know when to be ſilent, and when to ſpeake: then let her learne the Pſalmes by heart, and without booke: and till ſhe be twelue yeares of age, or marriageable, let her make the bookes of Salomon, the Goſpels, Apoſtles, and Prophets, the treaſure of her heart. Thus writeth S. *Hierome*: out of whoſe golden words, I note theſe golden obſeruations. Firſt, that both men and women in his daies, did ſtudie and read the Scriptures as diligently and painefully as the monkes. Secondly, that in his time they thought themſelues the happieſt people, who could con by heart the moſt texts of holy ſcripture: Whereas amongſt the papiſts they are deemed moſt holy, that can by heart no ſcripture at all, but abſtaine from the reading thereof, as from the poyſon of their ſoules. Thirdly, that young women being but ſeauen yeares of age, muſt be acquainted with the holy ſcriptures, and learne by heart the booke of Pſalmes. Fourthly, that from ſeauen yeares vpward vntill puberty, that is to ſay, vntill the twelft yeare of their age, they muſt read ſeriouſly the Bookes of *Salomon*, the Goſpels, Apoſtles, and Prophets, and ſet their whole delight therein.

Hier. ad Celant. tom. 1. fol. 50. A.

And the ſame holy Father in his Epiſtle to the godly matrone *Celentia*, doth perſwade her for the beſt courſe of her life, to be continually conuerſant in the holy Scriptures. Theſe are his words: *Sint ergo diuinæ ſcripturæ ſemper in manibus tuis & ſugiter mente voluantur.* Let therefore the holy

ſcriptu

ſcriptures be alwayes in thy hands, and let them be vnceſſantly toſſed and rolled in thy minde.

Saint *Theodoretus* telleth vs with good liking thereof, that in his time the ſcriptures were tranſlated into all manner of languages, and that they were not onely vnderſtood of doctors, and maſters of the Church, but euen of the laypeople, and common artificers. His expreſſe wordes I will alledge, which are theſe; *Hebraici vero libri, non modo in Græcum idioma conuerſi ſunt, ſed in Romanam quoque linguam, Ægiptiam, Perſicam, Indicam, Armenicã q3, & Scythicam, at q3 adeo Sauromaticam, ſemel q3 vt dicam, in linguas omnes, quibus ad hanc diem nationes vtuntur. Sequitur paulò inferius, foſſoreſ q3 adeo, ac bubulcos inuenias; plantarum q3 conſitores de diuina trinitate, rerum q3 omnium creatione diſcertantes.* The Hebrew bookes are turned not onely into the Greeke tongue, but alſo into the Roman Language, alſo into the Ægiptian, Perſian, Indians, Armenian, and Scythian, as alſo into the Sauromaticke tongue, and to ſpeake all in a word, into all tongues which in this day are in vſe amongſt nations. And after hee hath told vs, that the Church-doctrine is knowne to all maner artizans of both ſexes; hee addeth, that we may finde ditchers, deluers, neatheards, and gardiners, diſputing euen of the bleſſed Trinitie, and of the creation of all things. Whereupon it is euident, that in the ancient Church, and in the time of old Religion, (as the ſilly fooliſh papiſts call their Romiſh inuentions, which is indeed a newly inuented Religion, as I haue prooued in my Suruey of Poperie) euery Nation had the holy ſcriptures in their vulgar language: and that in thoſe dayes, all the Chriſtians did read the holy Scriptures ſo ſeriouſly, that both men and women, of all trades and conditions, were able to diſpute of the holy Trinitie, and of the world. Which two points doubtleſſe, are the moſt difficult, obſcure, hard, and intricate articles, in the whole courſe of Theologie.

Theodor. lib. 5. de Græca. affect. curat. pa. 521.

The Ieſuit *Bellarmine* (a wonderfull thing to be heard.

and almost incredible, saving (that the truth must needes in time haue the vpper hand) confesseth so much vnawares, as is able sufficiently to prooue and conclude my intended scope and proposition. Theſe are his expresse words; *His notatis, dico illa omnia scripta esse ab Apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, & quæ ipsi palam omnibus, vulgo prædicauerant; alia autem non omnia scripta esse.* Theſe obseruations being marked, I answere, that all those things were written by the Apostles, which are necessary for all men, and which the Apostles preached openly to all the vulgar people; but that all other things were not written. Thus writeth our skilfull Iesuit, who in the name of all Papists (being as it were their mouth) saith all that can bee saide, in defence of late Romish Religion. Out of whose words, I note first, that all things necessary for all men and all women, old men, young men, maides, and babes, rich and poore, noble and ignoble, are set downe and conteyned in the holy scriptures. Secondly, that all things conteined in the written word, are necessary for all people. Thirdly, that those things which are not contained in the written word, were neuer preached openly to all people, but secretly, to some few persons in secret corners; peraduenture to our Iesuites and Iesuited popelings, saving that their sect was not then hatched, as which is not yet eighty yeares olde. Fourthly, that those things, which are not conteined in the scriptures and written word, are not necessary for all people, but onely for Iesuites and Papists, to bring them to perdition. Fifthly, that seeing on the one side, all things needfull for all men and all women, for yong and old, rich and poore, noble and ignoble, are conteyned in the scriptures. And seeing withall on the other side, that all things in the written word, are necessary for all people, (marke well what I say, gentle Reader, for I build my worke vpon that foundation which the Iesuit hath laid) it followeth by necessarie consequution, that all people ought seriously to reade the holy scriptures: as

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 1911. lib. 4. de verbo Dei scripto, cap. 11. a.

also

also that they may safely contemne all vnwritten traditions, as nothing needefull or pertaining to them. But let vs heare our Cardinall Iesuit once againe speake for himselfe, and for the honour of this holy father the Pope. These are his expresse words: *At in nouo testamento, quia Christus impleuit figuras & prophetias; etsi multi non intelligunt sententias scripturarum, intelligunt tamen ipsa mysteria redemptionis, etiam rustici & mulieres.* But in the new testament, because Christ hath fulfilled the figures and the prophesies; although many doe not vnderstand the sentences of the scriptures, yet do they vnderstand the mysteries of our redemption, euen the common countrey fellowes, and the very women. *Bellar. de verbo dei, lib. 3. cap. 2. tom. 1. col. 129.*

Thus writeth our Iesuit, affirming, that euen women and the very rustickes of the countrey, doe vnderstand the scriptures, so farre foorth as pertaineth to the mysteries of their redemption: and I pray you, why then doth the Pope debarre them from the reading thereof? What more knowledge is needefull ouer and besides the mysteries of mans redemption? It is all the knowledge which Saint *Paule* desired to haue: who (as he saith of himselfe) esteemed not to know any thing among them, saue Iesus Christ, and him crucified. I therefore conclude by our Iesuits owne free graunt, that behooueth all men and women, children and maids, diligently to read the holy scriptures, seeing they may vnderstand therein all the mysteries of their redemption, *viz.* all knowledge necessarie for their saluation. Which knowledge is so necessarie, as nothing can be more. Ye (saith God by the mouth of his seruant *Moses*) shall lay vp these my woordes in your heart and in your soule, and binde them for a signe vppon your hand, that they may be as a frontlet betweene your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest downe, and when thou risest vp. And thou shalt write them vppon the posts of thine house, and *1. Cor. 2. v. 2.* *Deuc. 11. v. 18 19. 20.* *Deu. 6. v. 8. 9.* *Deut. 4. v. 9.*

and vpon thy gates. But our Papists obiect against vs, that when the Fathers exhort all men and women to read the scriptures, they speake as pulpit-men agreeably to their audience, and the peoples default; but not as teachers in the Schoole, making exact and generall rules to be obserued in all places and times. To which I answere first, that the truth must be spoken as well in the Pulpit, as in the Schoole. Secondly, that the doctrine in pulpit is and ought to be as exact, absolute, and necessarie, as the doctrine in schoole: The sole and onely difference is or ought to be thus, *viz.* That the pulpit hath euer the pricke of exhortation annexed, which the schoole wanteth. For the Preacher may not speake at randon in the Pulpit, but euen there must hee haue the girdle of truth about his loynes. Thirdly, that holy *Dauid* regarded no such popish distinction, when asking whereby a yong man shall cleanse his wayes? hee answereth thus: By study, mediration, and keeping of the Law of God. Neyther the Godly men in Berhæa, when they dayly searched the Scriptures, euen to examine the doctrine of the Apostles by them. Our Papists obiect likewise, that Saint *Paul* will haue women to liue in silence, and not to chat and prattle of the Scriptures. I answere, that though S. *Paul* will not permit women to teach publikely before men; yet doth hee neither forbid them to reade the scriptures, nor yet to teach priuately, when due circumstances doe occure. For the same Apostle else-where commaundeth mothers to teach godly things to their Children. So *Salomon*, the wisest childe that euer was among the sonnes of *Adam*, one Christ euer excepted, confesseth plainely and humbly, what doctrine his mother *Bethsheba* taught him. So *Priscilla*, wife to *Aquila* the Iew borne in Pontus, expoundeth the Scriptures to the Iew *Apollo* borne at Alexandria, a verie eloquent man. So *Timothie* was throughly instructed in the scriptures by his mother *Eunice*, and by his grandmother *Lois*. By which notable example it is euident and cleere to euery one, that neither

Rhemes testament in prefatio sect. 1.

Psal. 119. *v.* 9.

Act. 17. *v.* 11.

1. *Tim.* 2. *v.* 12

Tit. 2. *v.* 3.

Prou. 31. *v.* 1.

Act 18. *v.* 26.

2. *Tit.* 1. *v.* 5. & 2. *Ti.* 3. *v.* 15.

neither mothers must forbeare to teach, nor yet young babes forbeare to learne the holy scriptures.

The third Proposition.

Traditions must bee examined by the holy Scriptures, which is the true touchstone of veritie; and then onely admitted, when they are found to be consonant to the same. For proofe of this proposition, the very name or woord (Canonicall) is of it selfe sufficient. For (Canon) is a Greeke word, which signifieth a rule, and therevppon those bookes are called the Canonicall scriptures, which are the rules of our faith. And consequently, whatsoeuer is not consonant to the scriptures, the same ought to be reiected, as pernitious, and swaruing from the rule of our faith. For this cause doth the Prophet *Esay* send vs to the law, and to the testimony, there to trie the truth. *Esa. 8. v. 20.* For this cause doth the Prophet *Malachie* exhort the people euer to be mindfull of the law of *Moses*. *Mal. 4. 4.* For this cause doth the Prophet *Dauid* tell vs, That Gods word is a lanterne to our feet. *Ps. 119. v. 105* For this cause saith S. *Peter*, That Gods word is a light shining in darke places, vntill the day-star arise in our hearts. *2. Pet. 1. v. 19.* For this cause did Christ himselfe exhort the Iewes to read seriously the holy scriptures. *Joh. 5. v. 39.* For this cause said christ, That the Pharisies erred, because they knew not the scriptures. *Mat. 22. v. 29.* For this cause did the men at *Berhæa* trie the truth of S. *Paules* doctrine by the scriptures. *Act. 17. v. 11.* For this cause doth S. *Iohn* exhort vs not to beleeue euery spirit, but to trie the Spirits, if they bee of God. *1 Joh. 4. v. 1.* For this cause doth S. *Paule* pronounce him accursed that preacheth any doctrine not contained in the scriptures. *Gal. 1. 2.* For both S. *Austen* and S. *Basill* doe expound that place of the written word. *Aug. cont. literas Pet. lib. 3. cap. 6. tom. 7.* And the truth thereof is already proued, because the Apostles taught no needefull doctrine, which they did not after commit to writing.

S. *Cyprian* would not yeeld to *Stephanus* then Bishop of Rome, in the controuersie concerning rebaptization; but

Cyprian epist. ad Pomp. 74. sharply reproued him for leaning to tradition, and demaunded of him, by what scripture he could proue his tradition? For, in his daies it was not ynough to alleadge tradition for the proofe of any doctrine. And much lesse was it a rule in S. *Cyprians* time to follow the bishop of Romes definitiue sentence in matters of faith and doctrine. Though our sottish and blind papists in these latter daies do admit and reuerence his sentence, euen as the holy Gospell. See S. *Cyprians* words in the first proposition.

When the Arrians would not admit the word (ὁμοούσιον) because it was not found in the scriptures, the fathers of the counsell did not then alleadge tradition for proofe thereof; neither did they say, that many things must be beleiued which are not written: but they answered simply, That though that word were not expresly written, yet was it vertually and effectually contained in the scriptures. This assertion is euident by the testimony of Saint *Athanasius*, whose words are these: *Sed tamen cognoscat quisquis est studiosoris animi, has voces tametsi in scripturis non reperiantur, habere tamen eas eam sententiam quam scripturæ volunt.* Although the expresse woords be not found in the scripture, yet haue they that meaning and sence which the scripture approueth and intendeth, as euery one that studieth the scripture seriously, may easily vnderstand.

Athanas. de decret. nic. synod. to. 2. prope finem.

Origen giueth counsell to try all doctrines by the scriptures, euen as pure gold is tryed by the touchstone. His words are set downe at large in my booke of Motiues, and they are well worth the reading.

Origē in Mat. hom. 25. & hom. 1. in 1. cap Ier.

Tertullian hath these words: *Id esse verum, quodcunq; primum; id esse adulterum, quodcunq; posterius.* We must know, that that is the truth, whatsoeuer was first; and that that is counterfet, whatsoeuer commeth after the first.

Tertul. aduers. praxe. in principe.

S. *Austen* hath many golden sentences and worthy testimonies to this end and purpose. One onely I will here recount, where he hath these words: *Nemo mihi dicat, ô quid dixit Donatus, aut quid dixit Parmenianus, aut Pontius, aut quilibet*

Aug. de vint. eccles. cap. 10. non longe ab initio. tom. 7.

quilibet illorum : quia nec Catholicis episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, vt contra canonicas dei scripturas aliquid sentiãt. Let no man say to me, oh what said *Donatus*, or what said *Parmenianus*, or *Pontius*, or any of them; because we must not consent euen to Catholicke Bishops, if it so fall out, that they erre in any point, and speake against the canonicall scriptures.

Saint *Chrysostome*, surnamed the golden mouthed doctor, agreeth vniformely vnto the other fathers in many places of his workes. One onely period shall for the present suffice, where he hath these golden words ; *Quomodo autem non absurdum est propter pecunias alijs non credere, sed ipsas numerare & supputare, pro rebus autem amphoribus, aliorum sententiam sequi simpiciter ; presertim, cum habeamus omnium exactissimam trutinam, & gnomonem, ac regulam, diuinarum inquam legum assertionem. Ideo obsecro & oro omnes vos, vt relinquatis quidnam huic vel illi videatur, deq; his à scripturis hac etiam inquirite, & veras diuitias discentes eas sectemur, vt & æterna bona assequamur.* How can it but be absurd, that in money-matters we will not credit others, but will tell the money our selues ; and for all that in affaires of greater importance, (which concerne the health and saluation of our soules) we can be content simply to follow the iudgement and opinion of others ; especially, when we haue the most exact ballance, squire, and rule of all things, I meane the plaine testimonie of Gods lawes. I therefore pray and beseech you all, that you will reiect what this man or that man thinketh, and search the truth out of the scripture ; that learning true riches, we may follow them, and so attaine eternall life. Behold here (gentle reader) a most excellent and christian exhortation, a very godly and golden aduiso, giuẽ vs by this holy Father. If we will not (saith he) trust others to tell our money, but for sureneſſe will tell it our selues ; much lesse should we trust others, and much lesse depend vppon their iudgements and sayings, in matters touching our saluation : but our selues

Chry. in Cor. 7. hom. 13. in fine.

must learne and know such things, by diligent reading of the holy scriptures. Neither must we beleeue what this or that man saith, but what we find to be true by painefull study of the holy scriptures. Now let vs heare attentiuely, what the best approoued papists teach vs, concerning this important and most weighty controuersie.

Victor. de aug. charit. relect. 8 p. 308.

Franciscus à victoria, a learned schoole-man and Spanish popish Frier, yeelds his opinion in these expresse wordes: *Propter quas (opiniones) nullo modo debemus discedere à regula & synceritate scripturarum.* For which opinions we may in no wise depart from the rule and syncerity of the scriptures.

Victor. de sacra. pa. 120.

Againe, in another place he hath these words: *Non est mihi certum, licet in hoc conueniant omnes, quia in scriptura non habetur.* I do not thinke it sure and certaine, although all writers agree therevnto, because it is not to be found in the holy scriptures.

Melchior Canus, another learned schoole-doctor and renowned popish Bishop, confirmeth the same doctrine in these words: *Fatemur non audiendos esse sacerdotes, nisi docuerint iuxta legem domini.* We graunt, that we must not giue eare or hearken to the priests, except they shall teach vs according to Gods law.

Canus de locis, lib. 3. cap. vlt.

Loe, the Papists affirme plainely, that no doctrine is sound, or to be receiued, but that onely which is tried to be true by Gods word. Neither may we beleeue the Doctrine of any popish priest, vnlesse it be agreeable to Gods law. Now doubtlesse, if the Pope will be tried and iudged by this doctrine, which his best Doctors haue published to the world (the spirit of God hauing enforced them thereunto) we shall soone agree in all controuersies of religion. And certes, this their Doctrine is so certaine and euident, that the Iesuit *Bellarmine* singeth the same song with them; which my selfe could not easily haue beleeued, if I had not read his owne testimony in his owne Booke. These are his expresse words: *Sine dubio singuli episcopi errare possunt,*

Bellar. de conc. l. 2. c. 2. in fine.

possunt, & aliquando errant, & inter se quandoq; dissentiunt, vt nescianus quisnam eorũ sequendus est. It is without al doubt, that all Bishops seuerally may erre, and sometime doe erre, and doe so disagree among themselues, that wee cannot in the world tell which of them we may safely follow. Thus you see euen by the Iesuites verdict, that in the Popish Church, all their Bishops doe so erre, and sometimes so dissent one from another, that no Papist can tell indeede which of them it is best to follow. To which doctrine I will very willingly subscribe, aduising this Iesuit and all other Iesuited Papists to remember well this doctrine, and not to hang their soules henceforth vpon their iarring and doting Popish fathers; whom (as their deere Iesuit and renowmed Cardinall *Bellarmine* telleth them) they may not safely follow. And least the Iesuit or some for him shall answere me, or say in his defence, That albeit all Popish Bishops may erre seuerally, and dissent among themselues, as is already saide; yet can they not erre when they are called together in a Synode or Counsell, and the same confirmed by the Pope. This is all doubtlesse that possibly can be said in defence of Popish doctrine: And consequently, if I shall once prooue this to bee a rotten foundation, then must all popish buildings raised vpon the same, fall downe, and be euen with the ground. Marke (gentle Reader) my sincere reply, which I shall pithyly and plainely set downe in this behalfe. Wherein for perspicuitie sake, I will proceede by way of conclusions.

The first Conclusion.

The Pope was neuer present at the Counsels in the East Churches, by himselfe, and in his owne person. This conclusion is freely confessed by the Iesuit *Bellarmine*, who alleadgeth two reasons for the Popes absence: The one forsooth, because it was not conuenient, that the head should follow the members: The other, because the Emperour would euer sit in the highest place. Out of whose

Bellar. de conc. lib. 1. cap. 19.

words, I must needes note two important points by the way: The one, that in the auncient Church the higheſt place in the counſels, was euer reſerued to the Emperour: The other, that the Eaſt Churches did neuer acknowledge the Popes primacie, which he this day arrogantly challengeth ouer all kingdomes and regalities. To which twaine, this pleaſant adiunct perforce muſt bee annexed, *viz.* that our humble father the Pope (who calleth himſelfe hypocritically *ſeruus ſeruorum Dei*) would neuer come to the Counſels, becauſe forſooth hee could not endure to ſee the Emperour ſitting in the higheſt place.

The ſecond Concluſion.

The Pope ſtaying at home himſelfe, ſendeth his Legates to the counſels, to ſupply his place, to whom for all that, hee cannot commit his authoritie. This concluſion muſt needs ſeeme ſtrange to a great many; but I will confirme it with the teſtimony of ſuch a worthy and renowmed papiſt, that all whoſoeuer ſhall once heare or reade it, cannot but giue credit to the ſame.

Melchior Canus is the man from whoſe pen I receiued it; the caſe is euident, theſe are his words: *Decreta quæ à legato contra ſedis Apoſtolicæ traditionem approbantur, non habent Romanæ eccleſiæ authoritatem; nec aliter ſe habent, quam ſi à conſilio ſiue legatis prodiſſent. Sequitur; ſolidam auctoritatem quam in confirmandis & fratribus & dogmatibus Petrus habet, in legatos transferre non poteſt.* The decrees which the legate ſhall approue againſt the tradition of the Church of Rome, haue no authoritie from the Church of Rome; neyther are they of any more force, than if they had proceeded from the counſell without the conſent of the Legates. The ſound authoritie which *Peter* hath in confirming his brethren and decrees, he cannot transferre vnto his legates. Theſe are the expreſſe words of *Canus*, that worthy Biſhop, and ſtrong pillar of popiſh doctrine. Out of whoſe words I note firſt, that decrees of counſels be of

Canus lib. 5. de authorit. conc. cap. 5. pa. 102.

no force, when they haue not the consent of the Popes Legates. Secondly, that the decrees of counsels, euen when they haue the consent of the Legates, are of no force at all, if the Legates shall agree to any thing which is against the Popes minde. Thirdly, that the Pope cannot translate or giue his authoritie vnto the Legates. And consequently, that the Pope abuseth the whole world shamefully, when he calleth together all Bishops in the Christian world, to decide and determine controuersies in Religion: and for all that, will approue nothing that they doe or decree, vnlesse it be agreable to that which himselfe decreeth apart in his chaire at home.

The third conclusion.

Generall popish counsels in these our dayes, are euen as a nose of waxe: and the decrees thereof are as vncertaine as the winde. I prooue this conclusion by very strong and irrefragable reasons. The Iesuit *Bellarmine* hath these words: *Non dicimus, concessum episcoporum in consilijs legitimis esse verum iudicum concessum: & eorum decreta & Leges, necessario sequendas.* Wee say, that the consistorie of Bishops in lawfull counsels, is the true assembly of Iudges: and that their decrees and lawes must be obserued of necessitie. *Bellar. de con. li. 1. c. 18. to. 1.*

But in another place the same *Bellarmine* singeth another song in these expresse words; *Idem enim est, siue pontifex expresse concilium reprobet, siue concilium agat contra pontificis sententiam.* For it is all one, whether the Pope disanull the Counsell expresly, or the Counsell doe against the Popes minde. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 2. cap. 11.*

Againe, the same *Bellarmine* in another place auoucheth, that the greater part of voyces must beare the sway in counsels. These are his owne words: *Non potest fieri, vt aliquando ad finem controuersiarum deueniatur, nisi detur locus maiori parti suffragiorum.* It cannot bee, that there should euer bee made an end of controuersies, except the greater part of voyces may haue the vpper hand. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 1. cap. 21.*

Againe,

Bellar. de conc. lib. 2. cap. 11.

Againe in another place, he hath theſe words; *Eſt autem verum decretum conſilij, quod ſit à maiori parte: alioquin nullum eſſet legitimum conſilij decretum, cum ſemper aliqui diſſentiãt.* It is the true decree of the counſell, which hath the conſent of the greater part: for otherwiſe there ſhould bee no lawfull decree made at all, ſeeing ſome doe euermore diſſent.

Canus de locis lib. 5. cap. 5. pag. 164.

This notwithſtanding their famous Biſhop *Melchior Canus*, doth roundly tell vs another tale. Theſe are his expreſſe words. *Non itaq; quod in humanis conceſſionibus fit, plurimum apud nos ſententia prænalet; & paulo poſt; non enim numero hæc iudicantur, ſed pondere: pondus autem conſilijs dat ſummi pontificis, & grauita, & authoritas. Quæ ſi adſit, centum patres ſatis ſunt, ſin deſit, nulli ſint ſatis, ſint quamlibet plurimi.* It is not therefore with vs, as it is in humane aſſemblies, where moe voyces euer doe preuaile. For theſe matters are not to be iudged by number, but by waight. And the Councels receiue their weight from the grauitie and authoritie of the Pope. Thus writeth our Popiſh Biſhop *Canus*. Now who ſeeth not, that the decrees of Popiſh councels, are as vncertaine as the winde? for the Ieſuit telleth vs, that moe voyces muſt needes preuaile. But *Melchior* their renowmed Biſhop, is of another minde: that be they many, be they few, what part ſoeuer the Pope liketh, that ſame ſhall be true. For after the fathers haue faſted long, prayed much, conſulted grauely, deliberated maturely, decreed ſoberly, commaunded ſtrictly, and accurſed ſeuerely; neyther others, nor yet themſelues can tell, what ſhall be of force therein. For all muſt bee as ſhall beſt content the Popes humour, ſitting right ſtately in his chaire at Rome.

The fourth Concluſion.

No Biſhop can in theſe our dayes haue voyces in Councels, but ſuch as will firſt ſweare obedience to the Pope, and promiſe to defend his canon Law. This concluſion though it containe groſſe abſurdities, yet is it ſo cleere, as

Bellarmine

Bellarmine that Iesuiticall Cardinall cannot deny the same. These be his words. *Istud iuramentem non tollit episcoporum libertatem, quæ in concilijs necessaria est. Iurant enim se fore obedientes summo pontifici, quod intelligitur donec pontifex est, & dum iubet eo quæ secundum Deum & sacros canones iubere potest : sed non iurant se non dicturos quod sentiunt in concilio, vel se non deposituros eum, si hereticum esse conuincant.* This oath taketh not away the liberty of bishops, which in counsels is necessary. For they sweare that they will be obedient to the Pope ; which is to be vnderstood, so long as hee is Pope, and while he commaundeth those things, which hee may commaund agreeable to God, and to the holy canons; but they sweare not, that they will not speake what they thinke in the counsell, or that they will not depose the Pope if they prooue him to be an heretique. *Bellar. de conc. lib. 1. cap. vlt.*

Thus writeth *Bellarminus*, whose onely testimonie is most sufficient in all popish affaires : as who is the Popes sworne and tenderly beloued vassall, and whose bookes are dedicated to the Pope himselfe. Out of his woords I note first, that all cleargie men admitted to giue voices in councels, are sworne simply wholy to obay the Popes constitutions.

Secondly, that the said persons are sworne to beleeue, that the Pope cannot erre in his iudiciall decrees of faith and manners ; that no councels are of force, without the Popes confirmation ; that councels confirmed by him, are approoued by the holy Ghost ; that he can excommunicate and depose all Emperours, and Empresses, all Kings and Queenes, all Bishops and Archbishops in the Christian world ; that hee can by his pardons deliuer all soules out of purgatory, and goe himselfe to the deuill. For all these and a thousand like things, are strictly compriſed in his canons, and consequently in their most lamentable oath.

Thirdly, that they are sworne to admit his decrees, who (as they frecly grant) may for all that, be an heretique.

Fourthly, that they are sworne to reuerence and obey his iudgement in all matters of faith, whome they may iudge and depose for heresie.

Fiftly, that their fundamentall article, by which they make the Pope iudge ouer all controuersies; is quite ouerthrowne, and turned vpside downe, in this *Bellarminus* his explication. For when he sayth (while he commaundeth &c.) hee graunteth euery Bishop freedome to examine and iudge, when the Pope commaundeth thinges agreeable to God and the canons. Which libertie, if the Papists would constantly performe, all true Cstristians and perfect Catholikes would soone agree with thē. For none that beleiue aright, will deny obedience to the Pope, when he preacheth, teacheth, or commaundeth any thing which is agreeable to God and holy canons. But good Christians finding his Canons to be disholy, and his decrees to be against God; doe thinke as *Bellarmine* here teacheth them, that they are not bound to obey him. And that the reader may fully vnderstand the abhomination of the oath which all popish Bishops sweare vnto the Pope; I will here set downe the expresse woords, as I find them *verbatim* in the popes owne decretals; *Ego N. episcopus, ab hac hora fidelis ero S.* Petro, *sanctæq; Romanæ ecclesiæ, dominoq; meo Papæ N. eiusq; successoribus canonicè intrantibus. Sequitur; papatum Romanæ ecclesiæ, & regulas sanctorum patrum adiutor ero, ad defendendum & retinendum contra omnes homines; sic me Deus adiuuet, & hæc sancta euangilia.* I (*Iohn Watson*) Bishop, will be faithfull from this day forward to S. *Peter* and to the holy Church of Rome, and to my L. (*Boniface*) the Pope, and to his successors elected canonically; and I wil be an helper to keep and defend against al people the popedome or papall soueraignty, and the rules of the holye fathers; so God me helpe, and the holy Gospell.

Decret. lib. 1. tit. 24. cap. 4.

Loe here (gentle reader,) open and flat rebellion is required, and by euangelicall oath confirmed, of subiects against their soueraignes. For, the Bishops of euery country,

trie, are the subiects of the kings of the same countreyes; and yet doe they sweare to defend the Popes vsurped iurisdiction, and most bloodie tyrannie, against their naturall dread soueraignes. For they sweare to defend the Popes vsurped authoritie, against all the people, without exception. Which his diabolicall vsurped primacy, (as I haue prooued at large else where) extendeth it selfe to the translation of empires, kingdomes, and regalities.

These conclusions being well marked and remembred, the answere to the mightie obiection, which is as the foundation of poperie, will be plaine and easie, *viz.* that popish bishops may as well erre, when they are assembled together in a generall councell, as when they preach, teach, or write asunder. For first, the Pope himselfe will not shew his face in any councell, because the Emperour must sit aboue him, as is euident by the first conclusion. Secondly, when the Pope sendeth his legates to councels to supplie his place, he doth but delude the word by that fact; seeing he cannot impart his authoritie vnto them, as by the second conclusion is apparant. Thirdly, popish councels and synodes in these after ages, are flexible as a nose of waxe, and as vncertaine as the weathercocke, as is clearely prooued in the third conclusion. Fourthly, no bishops of late ages can haue voyces in popish councels, but such as will first sweare obedience to the Pope, and promise by oath to defend his vsurped power, and most execrable canon law, as by the fourth conclusion will appeare. Fiftly, that decree is true and iust, which is concluded by the greater part of the bishops there assembled; and yet the Pope sitting at Rome in his chaire, will reiect such decrees at his good pleasure, and define the sentence of fewer voyces to bee of force. This obseruation is euidently confirmed, by the due proofes of the third conclusion. Sixtly, the decrees of councels must needes be obeyed, as the papists tell vs; and yet the Pope may reiect them, and disanull them at his pleasure, euen dreaming in this chaire at home, or riding abroad

on his white palfrey. This to be so is euident to euery one, that shall seriously peruse the third conclusion. Yea, our papists of Rhemes in their commentary vpon the new testament, tell vs plainely and roundly; that the determination of councels is needelesse, because the Popes iudgement alone is infallible. Wherefore they adde this clause to salue the Popes proceedings, That councels are called not for necessitie sake, but for the better contentation of the weake. I therefore conclude against the popish supposed bulwarke, that seeing all Bishops may erre seuerally, as the Iesuit *Bellarmine* hath taught vs; and seeing also that the constitutions in popish councels are nothing else indeede, but the bare decrees of one onely bishop, as is alreadie prooued; it followeth of necessitie, and cannot be denied, that all bishops in the popish Church may erre egregiously; and that as well iointly as seuerally, as is to be seene at large in my Golden ballance of triall: to which treatise I referre the reader for better satisfaction, both touching the Popes double person, and concerning his priuate and publike errors, In the *interim*, I must needes tell the Papists; that a generall Councell, is aboue the Pope; that a generall Councell, hath power to depose the Pope; that a generall Councell, did *de facto* depose *Iohn* the 12 long sithence, and *Iohn* the 13 of that name; as I haue prooued at large by sound popish testimonie, in my Anatomie of popish tyrannie. And thus haue I prooued, that the sole and onely scripture inspired from heauen, is the infallible rule of truth; and that all traditions must be examined by the same, and then admitted when they be consonant thereunto, not otherwise: howsoeuer antiquitie be pretended in that behalfe.

Rhemes test. act. 15.

The fourth Proposition.

Ratio prima. Popish vnwritten traditions are so vncertaine and doubtfull, that the best learned papists are at great contention

tention about them, and cannot possibly bee accorded therein. For the proofe of this proposition, it were ynough to call to minde that great and endlesse strife, which was in the Church about 1400. yeeres sithence, betweene *Victor* then Bishop of Rome and the Bishops of Asia. The controuersie was among them, concerning the keeping of Easter. Tradition apostolicall was alleadged earnestly, and both sides did stoutly defend the same.

The same tradition was in controuersie afore *Polycarpus* the Bishop of Smyrna, and *Anicetus* the Bishop of Rome. But neither could *Polycarpe* perswade *Anicetus*, nor *Anicetus* perswade *Polycarpus*; albeit they both agreed as deere friends. The storie is set downe at large, by *Eusebius* a learned Father and most famous Historiographer. But *Victor* the Bishop of Rome dealt so furiously in that controuersie, that *Irenæus* and other bishops of Gallia, did sharpely reprooue him for the same. What needemore bee saide for the varietie and vncertaintie of traditions? For first, the bishops that thought and taught thus diuersly of traditions, did all of them liue within 200. yeares after Christ; at which time the Church was in good estate, and stayned with verie few or no corruptions at all. Secondly, the one side doubtlesse, must deedes be seduced with false and vnsound traditions: For apostolicall doctrine was vniforme and constant, and could not possibly bee contrarie to it selfe. Thirdly, Saint *Policarpe*, *Polycrates*, and the other bishops, did in those daies make no more reckoning of the bishop of Romes opinion, than they did of another mans. Fourthly, they all were so farre from acknowledging the bishop of Rome, to bee the supreame head of the Church, and that hee could not erre; that they all with vniforme assent, affirmed him to defend a grosse errour, and to hold a false opinion; that they all reputed themselues his equals, touching gouernement ecclesiasticall: that they all verie sharpely reprooued him, and with might and maine withstoode his proceedings. Where as

Euse. li. 5. hist. cap. 23 & ca. 24. per totum.

this day, if any bishops, magistrates, or other potentates in the word, (where poperie beareth the sway) should doe the like; they might all roundly be excommunicated, and not onely deposed from their iurisdiction, but also be burnt with fire and faggot for their paines. Fiftly, if Saint *Polycarpe* had cause in his time, being the flourishing age of the Church, to doubt of Romish traditions; much more doubtlesse haue we cause, at this day to stand in doubt thereof; in these doolefull dayes I say, in which iniquitie hath gotten the vpper hand; In which the Bishops of Rome haue brought a huge multitude of errours into the Church, and seduced a great part of the Christian world.

Ratio secunda. Chrysost. hom. 47 in mat. col. 405.

Another controuersie touching traditions, is for and about the keeping of Lent. For albeit Saint *Chrysostome* tell vs plainely, that Christ did not commaund vs to imitate h s fast, but to learne of him to be humble and meeke in heart; yet doe the Papists this day *mordicus* defend it, to be an apostolicall tradition; yea, many of them are so blinded and besotted with vnsauorie traditions, and superstitious illusions, that they deeme it a greater sinne to eate flesh in Lent, than to commit adulterie, murder, or periury.

Euseb. lib. 5. hist. cap. 24.

Of this vnwritten tradition, falsly supposed apostolical, *Eusebius Cæsariensis*, a famous Historiographer of great antiquitie, writeth in this manner. *Non solum de die paschæ agitur controuersia, sed & de ipsa specie ieunij. Quidam enim putant vno tantum die obseruari debere ieiunium; alij, duobus; alij vero, pluribus; nonnulli etiam, quadraginta. Quæ varietas obseruantiæ non nunc primum, neq; nostris temporibus cœpit, sed multò ante nos: ex illis vt opinor, qui non simpliciter quod ab initio traditum est, tenentes, in alium morem, vel per regligentiam, vel per imperitiam, postmodum decidêre.* The controuersie is not onely touching the day of Easter, but also concerning the verie kind or manner of fasting. For some thinke, they must onely fast one day, some two dayes, others moe dayes; and there bee that thinke, they should fast Fortie. Which varietie of

fasting

fasting did not now begin first, neither yet in our dayes, but long before our time; I thinke by them, who keeping not simply what they receiued from the beginning, did afterward fall to another manner, either of negligence, or else of ignorance.

Socrates in like manner reporteth hystorically, that they differed no lesse in their manner of eating, than they did in their daies of abstaining. For some (saith he) would eate no liuing thing; othersome of liuing thinges, eate onely fish; some together with fish, did eate also birds; but some eate only bread, and others at night eate all kind of meates without difference. Yea, hee telleth vs in the same place, that the Romans fast three weekes before Easter, besides the Sabboth and the Lords day. And that the Illyrians and Alexandrians do fast six weekes, and yet do they all tearme their fasts, Lent. By which testimonies euery man may easily perceiue, how doubtfull and vncertaine vnwritten traditions be. *Histor. tripar. lib. 9. cap. 38.*

Thirdly, there was another endlesse controuersie concerning traditions, betweene the Greekes and the Latins; whether the Eucharist ought to be celebrated in leauened or in vnleauened bread. *Ratio tertia.*

Fourthly. *Irenaus* a very auntient father, affirmeth out of Apostolicall tradition; that Christ was fortie yeeres old when hee suffered his bitter passion. *Papias* another father, saith vpon the like tradition, that Christ should raign 1000 yeeres after the generall resurrection. *Basilius* another holy father saith, that *Zacharias* the sonne of *Barachias* slaine betweene the altar and the temple, was father to S. *Iohn* the baptist. These absurdities the papists are this day ashamed to hold; and yet did these fathers receiue them by Apostolicall so supposed tradition, as their owne famous doctor *Andradius* graunteth willingly. *Ratio quarta.* *Frenæ. lib. 2. cap. 39.* *Euseb. lib. 3. cap vlt.* *Andrad. de trad. lib. 2. pag. 126.*

Fiftly, popish tradition telleth vs, that all the bishops of Rome one after another, haue taught succeissiuely the selfe same doctrine with S. *Peter*. Howbeit their own deere doctor *Ratio quinta.*

doctor and religious frier *Nicholaus de Lyra*, auoucheth plainely, roundly, and boldly, to the whole world, that many bishops of Rome haue fallen away from the faith, and become flat Apostataes. And least this my narration be thought strange vnto many, that our holy fathers the Popes should be Atheists or Apostataes, and that their owne deare brethren, in high esteeme among them, would neuer so write of them; I will deale plainely in this important point, and after my wonted manner set downe his owne expresse words. Thus doth he write: *Ex quo patet, quod ecclesia non consistit in hominibus ratione potestatis vel dignitatis, ecclesiasticæ vel secularis; quia multi principes, & summi pontifices, & alij inferiores, inuenti sunt à fide apostatasse. Propter quod ecclesia consistit in illis personis, in quibus est notitia vera, & confessio fidei & veritatis.* Wherby it is euident, that the Church doth not consist in men by reason of power or dignitie, either ecclesiasticall or secular; because many Princes and Popes, and others of the inferiour sort, are found to haue bene Apostataes, and to haue swarued wholy from faith. For which cause, the Church consisteth in those persons, in whom, there is true knowledge, and confession of the faith and of the truth.

Lyranus in cap. 16. mat.

Thus writeth this learned papist (whom their owne so supposed martyr sir *Thomas Moore* called a great clearke, as hee was indeede) whose words are well worthie to bee engrauen in marble with golden letrers. For by his iudgement it is cleare and euident, that not they who sit in S. *Peters* chaire, are euer the true and lawfull successors of S. *Peter*, but they only and solely that confesse and preach S. *Peters* faith and doctrine: as also that their receiued maxime (*vbi Papa, ibi Roma; vbi Roma, ibi ecclesia catholica*) is false, vaine, and friuolous. We therefore this day impugne nothing in popish proceedings, but the selfe same indeed, which famous popish doctors reprooued afore our time, and that in their publicke writings published freely to the whole world. Which thing, whosoeuer will seriously

ously ponder as my selfe haue done, that man must perforce, deteſt, and abhorre all popiſh ſuperſtitious trumperie. But of this argument I haue diſcourſed at large in my booke of Motiues.

Sixtly, popiſh tradition telleth vs, that the bleſſed virgine *Marie*, the true mother of true God and true man, was conceiued without originall ſinne, and that the biſhop of Rome did for that end ordaine a feaſtiuall day of her conception, to be kept vpon the eight of December. But by your leaue, *Aquinas* their own Angelicall Doctor affirmeth reſolutely, that ſhee was conceiued in originall ſinne. Yea, their other holy doctor and deare frier *Bernard* doth very ſharpely reprooue the Cathedrall Church of *Lyons*, becauſe they obſerued the feaſtiuitie of the conception of the bleſſed virgin ; and he calleth that their practiſe, the noueltie of preſumption, the mother of temeritie, the ſiſter of ſuperſtition, and the daughter of leuitie. That done, he addeth theſe words: *Hoc non eſt virginem honorare, ſed honori detrahere*. This is not to giue honour to the virgine, but to take honour from her. Yet Pope *Sixtus* the fourth, did inſtitute the feaſt of the conception.

Ratio ſexta.

Aquinas p.3. q.14.art.3. ad primum.

Bernard. epiſt. 174.pa.207.

A.D.1475.

Seuenthly, popiſh tradition telleth vs, that the Emperour *Conſtantine*, worthily ſurnamed the Great, was baptiſed at Rome in a font, there remaining to this day, my ſelfe haue ſeen them ſame. Howbeit, *Hieronymus*, *Euſebius*, *Socrates*, *Theodoretus*, *Sozomenus* *Caſſiodorus*, & *Pomponius*, do all affirme very conſtantly, that he was baptiſed at *Nichomedia*.

Ratio ſept.

Eightly, popiſh tradition hath brought flat idolatry into the Church, teaching to adore them as Saints and Gods friends, who were knowne heretickes, and profeſſed enemies to God and his Church. This to be ſo, their own deare friend and brother *Platina* will tell them, when he affirmeth the dead corps of *Hermannus* to haue been worſhipped for a ſaints reliques at *Ferrara*, the ſpace of twenty yeares together ; who for all that was an hereticke, as the ſame *Platina* auoucheth. Where twoo ſpeciall things are to be obſerued

Ratio octaua.

Plati. in vita Bonifacij octaui, vide Martinum Polonum, pa. 237. in append.

ſerued ſeriouſly : firſt, the vncertainty of vnwritten traditions; ſecondly, the danger in giuing credit to the ſame. Now, it remaineth for the better contentation of the reader, to make anſwere to ſuch obiections in defence of popiſh traditions, as the papiſts haue euer in their mouths, and boaſt of them, as if they were inſoluble.

The firſt Obiection.

We do not know, which bookes of the ſcripture are canonicall, and which are not, but only by the vnwritten traditions of the Church: And yet is this a matter of faith, and very neceſſary vnto ſaluation.

The Anſwere.

This is that mighty obiection, wherein the ppaiſts glorie and boaſt beyond all meaſure ; and ſay more raſhly than wiſely, that it can neuer bee truly anſwered. I therefore ſhall deſire the gentle reader to ponder well my woords, and then to iudge of the matter, as right reaſon ſhall preſcribe. My anſwere is this. Firſt, there is great ods betweene the primitiue, Church and the Church of late daies. Which to be ſo, the famous popiſh doctor *Durandus* will conteſt with mee. For the Apoſtles (as *Durand* ſaith wiſely) heard Chriſts doctrine, ſaw Chriſts myracles, and were repleniſhed with the holy ghoſt; and cõſequently they muſt needes bee fit witneſſes of all that Chriſt did and taught. But theſe adiuncts cannot be rightly aſcribed to the late Biſhops of Rome and their curſed Ieſuited brood. Secondly, the old teſtament was deliuered by the Iewes, and confirmed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles : and therefore as the papiſts admit that tradition, and withall doe reiect their other manifold vnwritten traditions, which the Iewes in their *Talmud* affirme to be of *Moſes*; euen ſo do we receiue this tradition, and reiect all vnwritten traditions contrarie to the ſame. Thirdly, the bookes of the new teſtament are but an expoſition of the law and the Prophets;

Durand in. 3 ſ d. 24. quæſt. 1.

Bellar. tom. 1. col. 187.

Vide Auguſt. tom. 6. pa. 184.

phets; as I haue alreadie prooued in the first propositiō of this present article: And consequently, it may bee discerned and tryed by the same; as the godly Bereans tryed S. *Paules* preaching. Fourthly, when we affirme all thinges necessarie for our saluation, to be compriſed and contained in the scripture: we then speake of them, as they are acknowledged and agreed vppon, both among the Iewes for the old Testament, in the which the new is comprehended: and ioyntly for the old and new, throughout the Christian world. And so this tradition is not excepted, but virtually implyed in our affirmation. Fiftly, the scriptures canonicall are discerned from not canonicall euen of themselues, like as the light is discerned from darkenesse, hardnesse from softnesse, and sweetnesse from bitternesse. Thy word ô Lord (saith the Prophet) is a lanterne to my feete, and a light vnto my pathes. We haue a right sure word of prophesie (saith S. *Peter*) whereunto if ye take heede, as vnto a light that shineth in a darke place ye doe well, vntill the day dawne, and the day-starre arise in your hearts. Yet most true it is, that the faithfull onely can discerne it. For as the Apostle saith, If Christs Gospell be hid, it is hid in them that perish: in whome the God of this world hath blinded the mindes of them which beleeue not, least the light of the Gospell of the glorie of Christ should shine vnto them. And the same Apostle elsewhere, teacheth vs, that the spirituall man iudgeth all thinges. Which text, two famous Papists, *Lyranus* and *Carthusianus* doe expound, of things pertaining to our saluation. S. *Iohn* is consonant to S. *Paule*, affirming, that the vnction which the faithfull haue receiued, doth teach them all thinges. Yea, Christ himselfe saith, That his sheepe doe heare his voice. And he addeth, that they follow him, because they know his voice. But doubtlesse, if Christs sheepe, that is, the faithfull and Gods elect people, doe knowe his voice, and therefore doe follow him: then by a necessarie consequence, they can know Christ speaking to them in the

Act. 17. *v.* 11.

Ps. 119. *v.* 105

2. *Pet.* 1. *v.* 19

2. *Cor.* 5. *v.* 3.

1. *Cor.* *v.* 15.

1. *Iob.* 2. *v.* 27.

Iob. 10. 3. *ibid.* *v.* 4.

holy scripture, and so can discerne holy writte from prophane fables or stories. *Melchior Canus* a famous Papist, maketh this case cleere: his wordes are set downe in my Golden ballance.

Sixtly, the formall obiect of our faith is *veritas prima*, the first verity, or God himselfe, as *Dionysius Areopagita* telleth vs. Yea, *Aquinas* that famous papist surnamed their angelicall Doctor, teacheth the selfe same doctrine. *Non enim fides inquit, diuina al cui assentitur, nisi quia est à Deo reuelatum.* For diuine faith (saith *Aquinas*) will not yeelde assent to any thing, vnlesse it bee reuealed of God. Which truth of doctrine, Saint *Austen* confirmeth in these golden words: *Iam hic videte magnum sacramentũ fratres: sonus verborum nostrorum aures percutit, magister intus est. Nolite putare quenquam hominem aliquid discere ab homine. Admonere possumus per strepitum vocis nostræ: si non sit intus qui doceat, inanis fit strepitus noster. Quã multi hinc indocti exituri sunt? quantum ad iure pertinet, omnibus locutus sum, sed quibus vnctio illa intus non loquiter, quos spiritus sanctus intus non docet, indocti redeunt. Magisteria forinsecus adiutoria quædã sunt & admonitiones: Cathedram in cœlo habet qui corda docet. Sequitur, interior magister est qui docet, Christus docet, inspiratio ipsius docet. Vbi illius inspiratio & illius vnctio non est, forinsecus inaniter perstrepunt verba.* Now brethren, behold heere a great sacrament: the sound of our wordes pierceth your eares, but the master that teacheth you, is within. Thinke not, that man learneth any thing of man: we (preachers) may admonish by the soũd of words: but if he be not within that teacheth, in vaine is our sound: how many will goe hence vntaught? For mine owne part, I haue spoken to all: but to whom that vnction speaketh not inwardly, whom the holy Ghost teacheth not within, they goe home vntaught, as they came. The outward teachings are some helpes & admonitions: but he sitteth in his chaire in heauen that teacheth the hart, The master is within that teacheth, it is Christ that teacheth, it is his inspiration that instructeth.

Deuinis nominib. cap. 7.

Aquinas, 2. 2. q. 1. art. 1. o.

Aug. in epist. Ioannis, tract. 3. tom. 9. col. 408.

eteth. Where his inspiration and his vnction is not, there the outward noise of words is in vaine: Thus writeth this auntient and learned father, with many moe wordes to the like effect. By whose doctrine wee may learne sufficiently, if nothing else were said: that howsoeuer men teach, howsoeuer *Paul* plant, or *Apollo* water, yet will no increase follow, vnlesse God gaue the same. I therefore conclude, that wee doe not beleeue this booke or that booke to be canonicall, because this man or that man, or the Church saith so; but that the scripture is αὐτόπιστος; that it hath in it selfe that dignity, which is worthy to haue credite; that the declaration of the Church, doth not make vs beleeue the scripture, but is onely an outward helpe to bring vs thereunto; and that wee therefore indeede beleeue the scripture, and this or that booke to be canonicall, because God doth inwardly teach vs and perswade our hearts so to beleeue. For certes, if wee should beleeue, that this or that booke is canonicall scripture, because the Church saith so; then should the formall obiect of our faith, and the vltimate tearme into which our faith is resolued, be man, and not *prima veritas*, or God himselfe, as *Areopagita* and *Aquinas* teach vs. And it will not helpe the papists to replie out of Saint *Augustine*, That hee would not haue beleeued the Gospell, vnlesse the authoritie of the Church had mooued him thereunto. For Saint *Austens* words are these; *Nisi authoritas ecclesiæ me commoueret.* I would not haue beleeued the Gospell, if the authoritie of the Church had not iointly mooued mee thereunto. For we must note, that there is a great difference betweene *mouere* and *commouere*. *Mouere* is to moue absolutely, and a part by it selfe; but *commouere* is to moue respectiuely and together with another thing. So S. *Austens* meaning is nothing else indeede, but that the authoritie of the Church did outwardly concurre with the inward motion of the holy Ghost, to bring him to the faith of the Gospell. Now, Saint *Austens* meaning is this and none

Auguſt. contra epiſt. Manich. tom. 6. cap. 5. pag. 79.

other; *viz.* that hee maketh much more account of the vniuersall Church, than of *Manichæus* and his complices; becauſe the Church did firſt moue him to heare the Goſpell preached, and to giue ſome credit to the ſame. I ſay (ſome credit) becauſe the Churches authoritie did onely moue him to beleeue the Goſpell, *fide humana, non fide diuina:* with humane faith, not with faith diuine. For this diuine faith, with which wee Chriſtians doe beleeue the Goſpell, proceedeth not from the outward teaching of man, but from the inward inſtruction of the holy Ghoſt, as I haue out of the ſame *Auſten* already proued. Yea, the ſelfe ſame father declareth in the ſame Chapter, that hee ſpeaketh of himſelfe as being a Manichee, not as being a Chriſtian. What (ſaith Saint *Auſten*) wouldeſt thou ſay to him, that ſhould anſwere thee, I doe not beleeue it, but for the authority of the Church? And this ſenſe is confirmed, becauſe S. *Auſten* confeſſeth in the very ſame chapter, that the authoritie of the Goſpell is aboue the authoritie of the Church. And in the chapter aforegoing, after he hath told vs what kept him in the catholike Church, and there hath reckoned vp the conſent of peoples and nations; authoritie begun with miracles, nouriſhed with hope, increaſed with charitie, eſtabliſhed with antiquitie: ſucceſſion of prieſts from Saint *Peters* ſeate, and the name of Catholike; hee addeth, that though theſe things bee great motiues to keepe him in the vnitie of the Church, yet muſt the truth of the ſcriptures bee preferred before them all. In regard whereof, he promiſeth to giue more credite to *Manichæus*, than to the Church, and to yeeld vnto his doctrine, if hee ſhall be able to prooue it out of the ſcripture: In the meane while hee muſt giue him leaue to preferre the credit of the catholike Church before his bare words, eſpecially, ſeeing the Church, but not *Manichæus*, was the outward meanes and externall helpe, that brought him to the faith of the Goſpell.

Cap. 5. cont. epiſt. fundam.

The second Obiection.

The baptisme of infants is a matter of faith, but not conteined in the holy scriptures; *ergo* not all things necessarie for mans saluation, are therein to be found.

The Answere.

I answere, that it is contained in the scriptures, and I proue it by sundry reasons. The first argument is drawne from the couenant. For infants being within the couenant, ought not to bee debarred from the signe and seale thereof. I will establish my couenant betweene mee and thee, and thy seede after thee in their generations, for an euerlasting couenant, to be God to thee, and to thy seede after thee. *Gen.17.v.7.* Againe, you are the children of the Prophets, and of the couenant which God made to our fathers, saying to *Abraham*, euen in thy seede shall all the families of the earth be blessed. *Gen.15.* *Gen.22.* Againe, repent, and be euery one of you baptised in the name of Iesus Christ, for the remission of sinnes, and yee shall receiue the gift of the holy Ghost. *Act.3.v.25.* *Act.2.v.38.* 39. For the promise was made to you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, euen so many as the Lord our God shall call. Againe, if the first fruits be holy, the whole lumpe also is holy: And if the roote be holy, the boughes also. *Rom.11 v.16.* Againe, suffer the yong children, and stay them not from comming vnto me: for to such belongeth the kingdome of heauen. *Mat.19.v.14* And where Saint *Mathew* hath little children, then S. *Luke* hath, τα βρεφη; infants, which can neither vnderstand, nor come. *Luk.18.v.17.* Againe, your children are holy yong children, therefore must be baptised. *1.Cor.7.v.14.*

The second argument is drawne from the analogie of the figure of the old testament. For circumcision to which baptisme succeeded, did pertaine to both ages, as well to yong as to old. In whom also yee are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the flesh subiect to sinne, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptisme, in whom yee are also risen againe *Coloss.2.v.11.*

through

through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him vp from the dead. Thus saith Saint *Paul*: by whose words we may learne sufficiently, that baptisme did succeed to circumcision, for the same end, vse, and purpose: *viz.* that by it we may, putting off the bodie of sinfull flesh, bee buried together with Christ, and rise againe with him through faith.

The third argument is drawne, from the practise of the Church. For the Apostles of our Lord Iesus were commanded to baptise all sorts of people without exception. Goe therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the father, and of the sonne, and of the holy Ghost. Againe, we reade in the historie Apostolicall, that the whole house of *Lydia* was baptised, neither yong nor old being excepted. Againe, we may find in the acts, that the keeper of the prison at Philippos was baptised, and all they of his household incontinent. Againe in another place, we may reade, that the whole family of *Stephanas* was baptised, not one at all exempted.

Mat.28.v.19

Act.16.v.15.

Act.16.v.33.

1.Cor.1.v.16.

The Obiection.

Infants haue no faith, *ergo* they may not be baptised.

The Answere.

I denie the antecedent, because their faith and profession is this; to be borne of the faithfull, in the vnitie of the Catholike Church. Againe, though they haue not actuall faith, yet haue they faith fundamentallie, and by inclination. In which sense our Lord Iesus doth reckon them among the faithfull, when he saith in this manner; Whosoeuer shall offend one of these little ones that beleeue in mee, it is better for him if a milstone were hanged about his neck, and hee were cast into the sea. Infants therefore, when they are baptized in the Church for faithfull, are then deemed to beleeue after their manner. Who, albeit they haue not faith in act, yet haue they the spirit, and

Mar.9.v.42.

and vertue, or foundation of faith, by Gods operation in them. Neither ought this thing to seeme strange vnto vs. For, if the infants of the wicked ones haue infidelity and impiety, though not in act, yet in inclination by nature, as writers grant; then truly may it be said, that the infants of the faithfull haue faith and piety, though not in act, yet in inclination by grace. For grace cānot be of lesse force through Christ, than nature through the fall of *Adam*: for God saith plainly; I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee. *Gen.17.v.7.*

The third Obiection.

We beleiue the trinity of persons in vnity of substance, but this is not in the scripture, *Ergo.*

The Answere.

I deny the assumption; for the trinitie of persons is plainly auouched in the holy Gospell, where it is thus written; But the comforter which is the holy Ghost, whome the Father will send in my name, hee shall teach you all things. Thus saith our Lord Iesus. In which words, we see mention made of three distinct persons; first, of the Father, which sendeth; secondly, of the holy Ghost, which is sent; thrinly, of the Sonne, in whose name he is sent. Againe in another place it is thus written; There are three which beare record in heauen, the Father, the Word, and the holy ghost, and these three are one, *Item Mat. 28. vers. 19.* *Joh. 14.v.26.* *1.Ioh.5.v.7.*

The fourth Obiection.

It is not to be found in the holy scripture, that Christ is consubstantiall, and of the same substance with the Father, *Ergo.*

The Answere.

The antecedent is false. For first, in the prophesie of *Zach.cap.13.*

Zacharias I finde theſe wordes; ariſe O ſword vpon my ſhepheard, and vpon the man that is my fellow, ſaith the Lord of hoſtes. Secondly, in many places of the new teſtament. Firſt, in theſe words; I and my Father are one. Secondly, in theſe words; If yee beleeue not mee, beleeue the works; that ye may know and beleeue, that the Father is in me, and I in him. Thirdly, in theſe words; Who being in the forme of God, thought it no robbery to be equall with God. Fourthly, in theſe words; She ſhall bring forth a Sonne, and thou ſhalt call his name Ieſus; for hee ſhall ſaue his people from their ſinnes. For this reſpect ſaith holy *Athanaſius*, that albeit the words be not expreſſed in the Scriptures, yet haue they that meaning which holy writ approoueth. Anſwere O Papiſts, if ye can; if not, repent for ſhame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

Eſa.9.6.
Ioh.10.30.
Ioh.10.38.
Phillip.2.6.
Heb.1.3.
Ioh.1.1.2.
Mat.1.21.& v.23.
Athanaſ.de decret.Nic. ſynod.tom.2.

The

The eight Article. Of the impoſſibilitie of keeping Gods commandements in Popiſh ſenſe.

TOuching this article, the Reader muſt ſeriouſly obſerue with me this adiunct, (in popiſh ſenſe) becauſe it is both emphaticall, and of great moment. For I will not affirme ſimply and abſolutely, that Gods Children cannot keepe his Commaundements in a godly ſenſe and Chriſtian meaning; but this I conſtantly deny, and at this preſent intend in God to prooue the ſame effectually againſt all Ieſuites and Ieſuited Papiſts; That none haue kept, do keepe, or can keepe Gods Commaundements in popiſh ſenſe and meaning; *viz.* that none are ſo pure, holy, and free from ſinne, that they can ſtand with God in iudgement, and challenge eternall life, as of debt due vnto them for their holy life. Marke well gentle Reader, my diſcourſe; for I hope in God, to hit the nayle on the head, and to ſet downe that which will be as heauie to the Papiſts heart, as a piece of lead.

The Apoſtle telleth vs in plaine and very expreſſe words, That the beſt liuers vpon earth are ſinners. *In multis enim offendimus omnes.* For wee all offend in many things. But certes, if it bee true, as it is moſt true indeede, (For S. *Iames* being inſpired with the holy Ghoſt cannot lye) That the holy Apoſtles committed many ſinnes; then doubtleſſe it is not in euery ones power, to keepe Gods Commaundements; neyther will it helpe the Papiſts to diſtinguiſh af- *Iacob.3.v.2.*

ter their wonted manner, of mortall and veniall sinnes. For, besides that I haue prooued alreadie in the sixt Article, that euery sinne is mortall in it owne proper nature; both the Greeke word ἀνομία, which signifieth the trāsgression of the law; and also the Hebrew word עון, which signifieth a declining from the right way, doe euidently conuince the same. For it can neuer be truely saide, that hee performeth and keepeth the law, which transgresseth the Law or swarueth from the same. It is the truth which S. *Paul* alleadgeth out of the Law; Cursed is euery one that abideth not in all things which are written in the booke of the law, to doe them. It is also the truth, which S. *Iames* saith, That whosoeuer keepeth the whole Lawe, and yet fayleth in one poynte, is become guilty of all. To which may bee added innumerable texts, both of the old and new Testament, that the best liuers vpon earth doe sinne and transgresse Gods Commaundements. Holy *Moses* telleth vs in the first booke of his Pentatench, That when God saw that the wickednesse of man was great on the earth, and that all the imaginations of the thoughts of his heart, were onely euill continually, then it repented God that hee had made man on the earth. *Iob* telleth vs, That God found no stedfastnesse in his Saints: yea, he saith farther, That the Heauens are not cleane in his sight. And he addeth these words, How much more is man abhominable and filthy, which drinketh iniquitie like water. The kingly Prophet saith, that in Gods sight none that liueth can be iustified. Wise *Salomon* saith, that no man liuing is able truely to say, he is cleane from sinne. The same wise man saith in like manner, that the iust man sinneth many times. *Esay* saith, that all our righteousnesse is as filthy clouts. *Esdras* saith, he was ashamed for his owne sinnes, and for the sinnes of the people, because their trespasse was growne vp vnto heauen. Saint *Paul* sheweth at large, that all men are sinners, and that no man is able to be iustified by his workes. All saith hee, both Iewes and

Gal.3.v.10.
Iac.2.v.10.
Gen.6.v.5.
Iob.15.v.15. & 35.5.
Psal.143.v.2.
Prou.20.v.9
Prou.24.16.
Esa.64.6.
Esdr.9.6.
Rom.3.v.9.10 12.19.23.

Gentiles

Gentiles are vnder sinne. There is none righteous, no not one: they haue all gone out of the way; they haue all beene made altogether vnprofitable: there is none that doth good, no not one. Now wee know, that whatsoe-the law saith, it saith to them which are vnder the Law, that euery mouth may bee stopped, and all the world be subiect to the iudgement of God. There is no difference, for all haue sinned, and are depriued of the glory of God, and are iustified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Iesus. Againe in another place, hee hath these words: for they being ignorant of the righteousnesse of God, and going about ro stablish their owne righteousnesse, haue not submitted themselues to the righteousnesse of God: the case is cleere and euident. For as the Prophet saith, If God should marke our iniquities, and reward vs after our deeds, none of vs were able to endure it. *Rom* 10. *v.* 3. *Psal.* 130. *v.* 3. 4.

Now, let vs heare S. *Austens* graue sentence, concerning this controuersie. *Diliges inquit, proximum tuum sicut teipsum; Deum vero ex toto corde, & ex tota anima, & ex tota mente; vt omnes cogitationes tuas, & omnem vitam, & omnem intellectum in illũ conferas, à quo habes ea ipsa quæ confers. Cum autem ait, toto corde, tota anima, tota mente, nullam vitæ nostræ partem reliquit, qua vacare debeat, & quasi locum dare, vt alia re velut frui.* Thou shalt loue thy neighbour, saith hee, as thy selfe; but God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soule, and with thy whole minde; that thou maist conferre vpon him all thy thoughts, and all thy life, and all thine vnderstanding, of whom thou hast receiued the selfe same which thou doest conferre or giue. But when he saith, with all thy heart, with all thy soule, with all thy mind, hee hath left no part of our life which may bee vacant, and as it were giue place, to haue fruition of any other thing. *Aug. de doctr. Christ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 22. *tom.* 3.

The same Saint *Austen* saith againe in another place; That this Commaundement of louing God with all our heart, cannot be perfectly fulfilled of any man in this life:

Aug. de perfect. iustit. ratioc. 16. col. 969. tom. 7.

These are his wordes; *In qua plenitudine charitatis præceptum illud implebitur: Diliges dominum Deum tuũ ex toto corde tuo, & ex tota anima tua, & ex tota mente tua. Nam cum est adhuc aliquid carnalis concupiscentiæ, quod vel continendo frœnetur, nõ omnimodo ex tota anima diligitur Deus. Non enim caro sine anima concupiscit, quamuis caro concupiscere dicatur, quia carnaliter anima concupiscit. Tunc erit iustus sine vllo omnino peccato, quia nulla lex erit in mẽbris eius repugnans legi mentis eius, sed prorsus toto corde, tota anima, tota mente diligit Deum, quod est primũ summumq; præceptum. Cur ergo non præciperetur homini ista perfectio, quamuis eam in hac vita nemo habeat? Nõ enim rectè curritur, si quo currendũ est nesciatur.* In which fulnesse of charitie that commandement shall be fulfilled. Thou shalt loue the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soule, and with all thy minde. For whiles any part of carnall concupiscence is remaining, which may be snppressed by containing, God so long is not in euery respect loued with all the soule. For the flesh coueteth not without the soule, albeit the flesh be said to couet, because the soule coueteth carnally. Then shall the iust bee without any sinne at all, because there shall be no Law in his members, rebelling against the law of his mind, but he shall loue God wholy with all his heart, with all his soule, and with all his mind, which is the first and chiefest commandement. Why therefore should not this perfection be commaunded vnto man, although no man can haue it in this life? or they cannot run aright, who know not whither they should run.

Out of these wordes of this holy father, and great learned writer, I gather these worthy lessons: First, that by Gods holy commaundement all men are bound to loue God, with all their heart, with all their soule, and with all their minde: Secondly, that whosoeuer suffereth any part of this life to bee vacant, and to haue fruition of any other thing, cannot fulfill this precept of louing God: Thirdly, that this precept of loue, cannot bee perfectly kept in this

this life: Fourthly, that originall concupiscence remaining in the regenerate, is the hinderance and breach of this commaundement. Fiftly, that this perfection of loue is lawfully commaunded, albeit none liuing doth or can attaine vnto it. And consequently, that it is not possible to any pure mortall man, perfectly to keepe Gods comandements.

Aquinas the Popes great Doctor and canonised Saint, graunteth freely, and affirmeth constantly, That the precept of louing God with the whole heart, cannot bee kept pefectly in this life. These are his owne expresse wordes: *Respondeo, quod præceptum aliquod dupliciter potest impleri; Vno modo perfectè, alio modo imperfectè. Sequitur; intendit Deus per hoc præceptum, vt homo totaliter vniatur: quod fiet in patria, qaando Deus erit omnia in omnibus, vt dicitur. 1. Cor. 15. & ideo plenè & perfectè in patria implebitur hoc præceptum: In via autem impletur, sed impefectè.* I answere, that the precept may bee fulfilled two wayes; one way perfectly, another way vnperfectly. God intendeth by this precept, to haue man wholy vnited to himselfe; which shall be effected in heauen, when God shall bee all in all. And therefore this precept shall bee fulfilled perfectly and fully in the countrey, but in the way it is fulfilled vnperfectly. (That is to say, perfectly in heauen, which is called our Countrey; and vnperfectly on earth, which is tearmed the way.) *Aquinas* 22. q. 44. art. 6. in. corp.

Out of these golden wordes of the famous Schoole-doctour *Aquinas*, (whose doctrine two Popes haue authorized for authenticall) I obserue these points of great importance. First, that God by commaunding all men to loue him with their whole hartes, did intend to vnite all men wholy vnto himselfe; so as no part of their loue should be left vacant, to be bestowed otherwise. Secondly, that this precept of louing God as wee are bound, can bee kept perfectly in heauen onely. Thirdly, that it

is

is not impossible in this life to keepe Gods Commaundementes in a godly sense and meaning; because wee may keepe them in some sort and measure, though not in that high and perfect degree which the Law requireth at our handes. For our great popish Doctour (marke well his wordes) saith plainely and constantly; *In via impletur preceptum, sed imperfectè.* The precept is fulfilled in the way, (or in this life) but vnperfectly. So that, when the Papists triumphing before the victorie, cry out against vs with open mouths, That we charge God with impietie, affirming him to haue commaunded to man things impossible: they may as well and with as much right and reason exclaime against their owne deere Doctor *Aquinas*, and consequently against their owne holy fathers the Popes, *Urbanus* the fourth, and *Innocentius* the fift; who haue commanded and strictly charged to receiue his doctrine as sent from heauen, concerning both faith and manners. For my selfe doe here teach the selfe same doctrine with *Aquinas*, as his owne expresse words very flatly purport. For my wonted manner is, to confute Poperie by the testimonies of best approued popish writers.

Aug. Hunneus in epist. ad. Pium. 5.

Barnardus the Popes deere Monke, and reuerend Abbot, iumpeth with *Aquinas* in these expresse words; *Quomodo ergo iubenda fuit, quæ implenda nullo modo erat? aut si placet tibi magis de affectuali charitate datũ fuisse mandatũ, non inde contendo, dummodo acquiescas & tu mihi, quod minimè in vita ista ab aliquo hominũ possit, vel poterit adimpleri. Quis enim sibi arrogare id audeat, quod* Paulus *ipse fatetur non comprehendisse? nec latuit preceptorem, precepti pondus hominum excedere vires: sed indicauit vtile ex hoc ipso suæ illos insufficientiæ admoneri, & vt scirent sanè ad quem iustitiæ finem niti pro viribus oporteret. Ergo mandando impossibilia, non preuaricatores homines fecit, sed humiles, vt omne os obstruatur, & subditus fiat omnis mundus Deo: quia ex operibus legis, non iustificabitur omnis caro coram illo. Accipientes quippe mandatum, &*

Barnard. in cant. serm. 50. tom. 1. col. 931

sentientes

sentientes defectum, clamabimus in cœlum, & miserebitur nostri Deus; & sciemus in illa die, quia nõ ex operibus iustitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed secundum suam misericordiam, saluos nos fecit. How then was it commaunded, which by no meanes could be performed? or if thou rather thinke, that the commaundement was giuen of affectuall charitie, I will not contend with thee therein, so thou also wilt yeeld vnto me herein, That no man in this life is able to keepe and performe the same. For who dareth to challenge that to himselfe, which *Paul* confesseth he could neuer attaine vnto? neither for all that was the commander ignorant, that the weight of the commaundement did surpasse the power and reach of man; but hee deemed it a thing profitable for them, that hereby they should bee admonished of their insufficiencie, and might know to what end of righteousnesse they ought with their best indeauours to apply themselues. Therefore by commaunding things impossible, he made not men preuaricatours, but humble, that euery mouth might bee stopped, and all the world made subiect vnto God, because by the workes of the Law, no flesh can be iustified in his sight. But after that wee haue receiued the commandement, and thereby perceiue our owne want, wee must cry vp to heauen, and God will haue mercy on vs: and then shall wee know, that hee hath saued vs, not for the workes of righteousnesse which wee haue done, but according to his owne (free) mercy. Thus writeth their owne deere Abbot *Bernardus*: out of whose words, I obserue many excellent documents. First, that God hath giuen vs those Commaundements, which wee cannot possibly keepe and performe. Secondly, that God knew right well, that it is not in our power to keepe his Lawes. Thirdly, that God commanded to vs impossible things, that wee might thereby acknowledge our owne insufficiency, & wholy rely vpon his fauor, help, and mercy. Fourthly, that we might hereby know, that our saluation proceedeth of mercy,

and not of the workes of righteousnesse which we haue done, and wherein the Papists seeke merit and iustification. So then, the doctrine which I now teach, is not my doctrine onely, but the flat doctrine of Saint *Austen*; yea, and the selfe same doctrine which the best learned Papists haue taught before me.

That it is not possible for man, to keepe gods commaundements perfectly in this life; no other proofe is needefull, saue onely the Lords Prayer. For in it, the best liuer vpon earth is taught, to aske forgiuenesse and pardon for his sinnes: and doubtlesse where pardon must bee demaunded, there the Law is not exactly obserued. The vsuall practise of all papists, is contrary hereunto. For in their ordinarie and daily Masses, as also in their quotidian auricular confessions, they confesse three seuerall times their most grieuous sinnes in these wordes; *Mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa.* In which publike daily confession, they must eyther confesse, that they deale hyprocritically, dissemble damnably, and mocke God most irreligiously; or else doubtlesse, that they cannot keepe Gods Commaundements, as they beare the world in hand they do. Now it remaineth, that I answere to some Popish obiections, which the Papists deeme and repute insoluble.

Nota, quod ne veniale quidem peccatum potest in deum referri. Ergo auertit a fine vltimo Ergo est peccatum mortale.

The first Obiection.

*Mat.*19.*v.*23 The young man told Christ, that hee had kept all the Commaundements, from his youth vp. Whom Christ reproued not, as though hee had not kept them indeed, but exhorted him to perfection, in selling all his possessions.

The answere.

I answere both with Saint *Austen* and Saint *Hierome*, That

That the young man answered vntruely, when hee saide, hee had kept all the Commaundements. Saint *Austen* hath these words; *Ille quidem tristis abscessit, qui viderit quemadmodum illa legis mandata seruauerat. Puto enim quod se arrogantius quam verius, seruasse responderat.* Hee went away sorrowfull, who knew how hee had kept the commandements of the Law. For I thinke, hee answered more arrogantly then truely, that hee had kept them. Saint *Hierome* saith plainely and roundly, *Mentitur*, Hee lyeth. And the circumstance of the texts going afore and following, doe purport no lesse vnto vs. *Augusti. epist. 89. col. 264.*

The second Obiection.

Saint *Paul* saith, For not the hearers of the law are iust with God, but the doers of the law be iustified. *Rom. 2. v. 13.*

The Answere.

Saint *Paul* meaneth nothing lesse in these wordes, than that a man in Gods sight can be iustified in his workes: But hee goeth about to conclude all vnder sinne, and so to haue neede of the glory of God; because none is able to performe and keepe the Law. For his whole scope and intent is this; to prooue that the Iewes did in vaine boast against the Gentiles that they had the law, seeing they did not keepe the same. As if hee had saide; if ye will be iustified by the Law, yee must performe and keepe the law, which ye doe not. For not the hearers of the law, but the doers are iust in Gods sight. I willingly graunt, and will it not denye; that if any of you Papists can perfectly obserue and keepe the Law, the same Papist shall be iustified by the merit of his works: but if any such Papist could be found, (which I am sure is impossible) yet should that papist heare what Saint *Paul* saith of holy *Abraham*. For saith hee, if *A-*

Rom.4.v.2. braham were iustified by works, he hath glory, (or wherein to boast) but not before God.

The third Obiection.

Mat.19.v.17. If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commaundements.

The Answere.

Our Sauiour Christ doth not shew in this place, how men doe attaine vnto eternall life; but hee sheweth what perfect obseruation of gods law, is required of them who looke to be iustified by the workes of the lawe. This my answere is cleered, by the question proposed vnto Christ, which was this; What good thing shall I doe, that I may haue eternall life?

Christ answered; If thou wilt haue eternall life by doing good woorkes, then must thou keepe Gods commaundements. But this is impossible, as is already prooued.

Vide B. in 3. cap. ad gal.

The fourth Obiection.

Ma.11.v.30. Christ saith, My yoke is easie, and my burden is light.
2.Iob.5.v.3. And Saint *Iohn* sayth, his commaundements are not heauie.

The Answere.

Non loquitur hic de iugo & onere legis, sed Euangelij. The lawe of god is impossible to be kept in such perfection, as the same requireth at our hands, as I haue alreadye prooued. Nouertheless, the yoke of Christ is sweeter, and his burden light, to all them which beleeue in him. For (as Saint *Peter* saith) The yoke of the lawe

Act.15.10.11.

is

is such a burden, as neyther wee, nor our fathers were able to beare: but wee beleeue to bee saued by the grace of our Lord Iesus. Christ hath taken away the curse of the Law: Christ hath satisfied for our transgressions of the Law: Christ sent by God in the similitude of sinfull flesh, blotted out the hand-writing that was against vs, and nailed it vpon the Crosse. There is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Iesus. Christ is our Iustification, our Sanctification, and our Redemption. By faith in Christ, wee doe ouercome the world. Christ is so mercifull, that hee refresheth all those which come vnto him. This being so, wee may truely say, that in Christ wee fulfill the Law; because hee is our righteousnesse, our sanctification, and our redemption; because hee hath ouercome death; because hee hath clothed vs with his righteousnesse; because hee hath couered our nakednesse with his garments; because in him wee haue gotten the victorie ouer Hell, Death, and Damnation.

Gal. 3. 13. *Rom.* 8. 3. *Col.* 2. 14. *Rom.* 8. 1. *1. Cor.* 1. 30. *1 Iohn.* 5. 4. *Mat.* 11. v. 28. *Col.* 2. 14. *1. Iohn.* 5. 4. *Act.* 15. 11.

This is it that Saint *Austen* sayeth, in these golden wordes: *Omnia ergo mandata tunc facta deputantur, quando quicquid non fit, ignoscitur.* All the Commaundements are then reputed as done, when whatsoeuer is not done, is (of mercie) forgiuen.

Aug. libr. 1. *retract. cap.* 19

The fift Obiection.

Saint *Hierome* saith, Hee is to bee detested as a blasphemer, that affirmeth God to haue commaunded any impossible thing. And Saint *Austen* saith, God can neyther commaund things impossible, because hee is iust, neyther condemne a man for that which hee could not auoyd, because he is mercifull.

Hieron. contr. Pelag. lib. 3. *&* 4. *Aug. serm.* 61. *de temp. tom.* 10.

The Answere.

I answere first, that hee is to bee detested as a blasphemer, that affirmeth God to haue commaunded any thing vnto man, which was either impossible in it selfe to bee done, or to bee done of man, as man. I say (impossible in it selfe) because otherwise, Christ himselfe could not haue fulfilled the Law: which to hold, is flat blasphemie against the Sonne of God. I say (impossible to bee done of man, as man;) because otherwise, the Protoplast *Adam* could not haue kept the Lawe: which to hold, is most absurd, and against all learning and learned men.

Secondly, that hee is to bee detested as a blasphemer, whosoeuer affirmeth, that any man in particular being a true beleeuer, cannot keepe and fulfill Gods Commaundements; in him, of whose fulnesse wee haue all receiued, and whose righteousnesse is ours, by his free gift and grace.

John.1.16. *1.Cor.1.30.*

Thirdly, that Gods Commaundements may in some measure (that is to say imperfectly) bee kept euen in this life of the regenerate. And this is not my answere, but euen that answere which the famous Papist *Aquinas* maketh to the obiection out of Saint *Hierome*: whose answere is very sufficient to stop the mouthes of all Papists, seeing his testimonie is to them as if it were an oracle from Heauen. To Saint *Austen* the same answere is very consonant, as both by the precedent and subsequent words will appeare. And if there bee any Papists whose appetites this answere cannot satisfie: of those Papists I would demaund this one thing, Why Infants not baptised before their dearh, are iustly damned for originall sinne, seeing they could not possibly auoide the same?

Aquinas.22. q.44.art.6. ad prim.

Omittatur hæc clausula, meo iudicio.

This is a Dilemma, which no papist can anoyd.

Hee

Hee that would know Saint *Austens* meaning more fully, both touching this obiection and others of like qualitie, may reade the same holy Father in his booke *De Correpț. & gratia*; and therein finde much excellent matter for his contentation in that behalfe.

Aug. de correp. & gratia. cap. 12. & 13. tom. 7.

Answere O Papists, if ye can; if not, repent for shame, and yeeld vnto the truth.

* *
*

τέλος.

Δόξα τῷ Θεῷ.